J
79.

A BRIEF DECLARATION OF THE LORDS SUPPER

WRITTEN BY

BISHOP *RIDLEY.*

Imprimatur,

Liber cui Titulus, [*A Brief Declaration of the Lord's Supper*, &c.]

Junii 7. 1688.

Guil. Needham RR. in Christo P. ac D. D. *Wilhelmo* Archiep. *Cant.* a Sacr. Dom.

A BRIEF

DECLARATION

OF THE

Lords Supper,

WRITTEN

By Dr. *NICHOLAS RIDLEY*,

Bishop of *LONDON*,

During his IMPRISONMENT.

With some other Determinations and Disputations concerning the same Argument, by the same Author.

To which is Annexed

An Extract of several Passages to the same Purpose, out of a Book, Intituled, *DIALLACTICON*, written by Dr. *JOHN POYNET*, Bishop of *Winchester* in the Reigns of *E.* 6. and *Q. Mary*.

Published by Mr Wharton

LONDON:

Printed for **Ric. Chiswell**, at the *Rose* and *Crown* in St. *Paul's Church-yard*, MDCLXXXVIII.

THE PREFACE.

THE *Doctrine of* Tranſubſtantiation *maintained by our Adverſaries of the Church of* Rome, *is ſo groſs, and highly repugnant to the firſt principles of reaſon, and univerſal ſenſe of mankind, that directly to defend it would be no leſs impoſſible than unſucceſsful. Artifices therefore were neceſſarily to be invented, which might palliate the deformity of ſo monſtrous an Opinion; and divert inquiſitive perſons from a direct examination of it, by amuſing them with confident aſſertions and extraneous Controverſies. Among theſe, the difference of Opinion between the firſt Reformers and preſent Divines of the Church of* England *hath of late been propoſed and urged with the greateſt vehemency; as if the firſt Reformers had believed ſomewhat equivalent to* Tranſubſtantiation; *and our preſent Divines, by aſſerting no other than a figurative Preſence of the material Body of Chriſt, had degenerated from the belief of their Forefathers.*

We might juſtly admire the unreaſonable confidence of thoſe men, who are not aſhamed to propoſe ſo manifeſt and groſs a falſhood, and eſteem it the higheſt folly; if we did not remember that it is taken up to defend a deſperate Cauſe, which admits no better Remedies. Can any Man in his right wits believe that ſo many hundred Martyrs ſhould ſuffer death, and ſpend their blood for ſo inconſiderable a nicety, as was the difference between them and their Perſecutors in the Doctrine of the Euchariſt, *if theſe late Repreſenters may be believed? That both Parties ſhould diſpute*

ſo earneſtly and vehemently againſt each other, and yet after all agree in the main? That the Romiſh *Biſhops ſhould treat the Reformers as Hereticks for denying* Tranſubſtantiation; *and the Reformers lay down their lives rather than acknowledge it; and yet neither the* firſt *to have defined it to be true, nor the* laſt *believed it to be falſe? Such crude Poſitions can find no entertainment, but in a mind already fitted to receive* Tranſubſtantiation *it ſelf, that is, devoid of Senſe and Reaſon.*

If we enquire the Reaſons and Arguments, wherewith our Adverſaries maintain ſuch incredible and extravagant aſſertions, we ſhall find them to be no other than theſe, That the firſt Reformers taught and aſſerted a Real Preſence *of the Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Sacrament; That they maintained the Body and Blood to be verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful Communicants; That they frequently affirmed the natural and ſubſtantial Body of Chriſt, that very Body which was taken by him of the Virgin* Mary, *to be preſent in the Sacrament. Theſe very expreſſions are at this day uſed by the Divines of the Church of* England; *whom yet our Adverſaries pretend to have departed from the belief of their Forefathers in this matter: So that if they prove the* firſt *Reformers to have believed a material preſence of Chriſt's Body, they will prove our* Preſent Divines *to believe the ſame. For the whole Controverſy will come to this iſſue, Whether they believed any material Preſence of Chriſt's Body, or any part of it, either by converſion, ſubſtitution, or union? If they poſitively diſowned this, as moſt certainly they did; then whatſoever expreſſions they might uſe, they could believe no other than a figurative Preſence of Chriſt's Body properly ſo called; which our Adverſaries now traduce under the name of* Zuinglianiſm. *And, indeed, if we give them leave to explain themſelves, they tell us, That in ſuch ex-*

preſſions they uſe the terms of Real Preſence, Nature *and* Subſtance, *not as Philoſophers, but as Divines; and that by denying the Euchariſt to be a figure only, or a naked figure, they mean no more, than that it is a true and real communication of the virtues and benefits of his Body, not only a meer figurative commemoration of them, which is the true notion of* Zuinglianiſm.

To prove this, and vindicate the honour of the firſt Reformers and modern Divines of our Church, and demonſtrate the intire conformity of the belief of both; it is thought convenient to cauſe ſome one Treatiſe of the firſt Reformers concerning this Subject to be Reprinted, that ſo every one might judge for himſelf, whether the pretenſions of our Adverſaries be indeed true and juſt; or rather the Preſent is intirely conformable to the precedent Doctrine of the Church of England. *To this end, among all the Writings of the firſt Reformers, this Treatiſe of Biſhop* Ridley, *which we here publiſh, will conduce moſt, by reaſon of the great and eminent Authority of the Author, which was ſo highly conſiderable beyond that of any other Reformer, that he may juſtly be eſteemed the Standard of the Doctrine of the Church of* England *at that time. Not only the aſſurance of his great learning and eminent ſtation in the Church, renders this probable; but that great part which he had in managing the Affairs of the* Reformation, *and the extraordinary deference paid to his Authority, and truſt repoſed in him by all Convocations, and the whole body of the Reformers, demonſtrate it. None can reaſonably be put in competition with him, except Archbiſhop* Cranmer; *and he alſo in his diſputation at* Oxford *profeſſed, that he received his Opinion concerning the* Euchariſt *from Biſhop* Ridley. *This the* Romiſh *Clergy were ſo ſenſible of in the time of Queen* Mary, *that by a plauſible calumny they endeavoured to perſuade the World, that the private opinion of*

Ridley

Ridley *was the only foundation of the Doctrine of the Reformed Church of* England: *For* Brooks *Biſhop of* Gloceſter, *Queen* Maries *Commiſſioner, diſputing againſt him in the publick Schools at* Oxford, *uſed this among other Arguments,* What a weak and feeble ſtay in Religion is this, I pray you? *Latimer* leaneth to *Cranmer, Cranmer* to *Ridley,* and *Ridley* to the ſingularity of his own Wit: So that if you can overthrow the ſingularity of *Ridley*'s Wit, then muſt needs the Religion of *Cranmer* and *Latimer* fall alſo. *To which I may add the words of Dr.* Fecknam, *Abbot of* Weſtminſter, *in his Speech in Parliament,* Primo Elizabethæ, *made in defence of the Church of* Rome, *which I have ſeen in Manuſcript.* Dr. *Ridley,* the notableſt learned of that Opinion in this Realm, did ſet forth at *Paul*'s Croſs the real preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Sacrament, with theſe words, which I heard, ſtaying then preſent; how that the Devil did believe the Sacrament of God was able to make of Stones Bread: And we Engliſh people, we do confeſs that Chriſt was the very Son of God, and yet will not believe that of Bread he made his very Body Fleſh and Blood; wherefore we are worſe than the Devil: ſince that our Saviour by expreſs words did more plainly affirm the ſame, when at his laſt Supper he took Bread, and ſaid unto his Diſciples; *Take ye, eat, this is my Body, which ſhall be given for you.* And ſhortly after, the ſaid Mr. Doctor *Ridley* notwithſtanding this moſt plain and open Speech at *Paul's Croſs,* did deny the ſame.

Fox's *Martyrol.* Vol. 3. p. 425.

Whether Fecknam *hath truly repreſented the words of* Ridley, *is uncertain. But from the laſt words of this paſſage it is manifeſt, that ſome, even in that time, taking occaſion from this Sermon, had charged Biſhop* Ridley *with aſſerting a Material Preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Sacrament:*

ment: and that he conſtantly denied himſelf to have meant or intended any ſuch preſence. In this therefore, and ſuch like expreſſions, he intended only (as himſelf aſſures us) to oppoſe thoſe, who ſo lightly eſteemed the Sacrament, as to make of it but a figure. For that but maketh it a bare ſign, without any more profit. *But to clear his intention in this matter from all remaining ſuſpicion of any kind of Material Preſence, I will annex a larger explication of it in his own words, in his laſt examination before the Queens Commiſſioners,* September 30. 1555. Ibid. vol. 3. p. 35.

In like ſort, as touching the Sermon, which I made at *Pauls Croſs*, you ſhall underſtand, that there were at *Pauls*, and divers other places, fixed railing Bills againſt the Sacrament, terming it Jack of the Box, the Sacrament of the Halter, Round Robbin, with ſuchlike unſeemly terms. For which cauſes, I, to rebuke the unreverend behaviour of certain evil diſpoſed perſons, Preached as reverendly of that Matter, as I might, declaring what eſtimation and reverence ought to be given to it; what danger enſued the miſ-handling thereof; affirming in that Sacrament to be truly and verily the Body and Blood of Chriſt, effectually by Grace and Spirit. Which words the unlearned underſtanding not, ſuppoſed that I had meant of the groſs and carnal being, which the Romiſh Decrees ſet forth, That a Body having life and motion, ſhould be indeed under the ſhapes of Bread and Wine.

This Treatiſe was written by Biſhop Ridley *during his impriſonment, a little before his death, and ſeveral Copies of it diſperſed abroad; of which, ſome being carried beyond Sea, Dr.* Grindall, *and other Engliſh Exiles, conceived a great deſire of cauſing it to be tranſlated into* Latin, *and Printing it. The Biſhop hearing of this, deſired that by all means they would lay aſide their reſolution, till they* Ibid. p. 374.

ſhould

ſhould ſee how God would diſpoſe of him. Accordingly it was omitted till his death. Immediately after his Martyrdom it was Tranſlated into elegant Latin, *but in a Paraphraſtical way, and Printed at* Geneva *1556. in 12s. The Engliſh Copy was Printed at* London *1586. 12s. which we have now cauſed to be faithfully Reprinted; adding to it out of Mr.* Fox's Martyrology, *divers Speeches, Diſputations and Determinations upon the ſame ſubject, which might farther illuſtrate and confirm his Opinion.*

Laſtly, Becauſe the late Biſhop of Oxford, *in his laſt Treatiſe, diſputing of the ancient Opinion of the Reformed Church of* England *concerning the Euchariſt, and as his Cauſe required it, maintaining the ſame aſſertion with our Adverſaries, That ſome material ſort of Preſence was then believed; doth mightily urge the Authority of the Learned Dr.* Poynet, *Biſhop of* Wincheſter, *at that time propoſed in his* Diallecticon; *and becauſe that Book is not in Engliſh, I have ſelected and annexed ſeveral paſſages out of it, which may demonſtrate what was indeed his notion of the* Real Preſence; *That he denied all manner of Material Preſence, and perfectly agreeth with* Ridley *in explaining the nature of it: And conſequently, that he is fouly either Miſrepreſented or Miſtaken by the Biſhop of* Oxford.

A BREEF

DECLARATION

OF THE

Lordes Supper.

WRITTEN

By the ſinguler Learned Man, and moſte conſtant Martyr of Chriſte,

NICHOLAS RIDLEY,

Biſhop of *LONDON*,

Priſoner in *Oxford*, a little before he ſuffered Death for the true teſtimonye of JESUS CHRISTE.

ROM. VIII.

For thy ſake are we killed all day long, and are counted as ſheep apoynted to be ſlain.
Neuertheleſſe, in all theſe thinges we ouercome through him that loue vs.

Printed at *LONDON*, 1586.

And Reprinted for Ric. Chiſwell, 1688.

TO THE
READER.

VNderſtand good (Reader) that this great Clark and bleſſed Martyr, Biſhop *Nicholas Ridley*, ſought not by ſettinge foorth any notable peece of learned woork, the vaine glory of the World, nor temporall freendſhip of men, for his preſent aduancement, much leſſe he hunted heerby for Biſhopricks and Benefices, as al his aduerſaries, the enemies of Chriſts Trueth and Ordinance commonly doo: but hauing conſideration of the great charge of Soules committed vnto him, and of the account thereof, which the Iuſtice of God would require at his handes, intending therwithal to be found blamles in the great daye of the Lord, ſeeing he was put a parte to defende the Goſpell: He not only forſook Landes, Goodes, World, Freends, and himſelfe with all, and teſtified the Trueth ſpecified in this Book by his learned mouth, in the open preſence of the World: but alſo to leaue a ſure Monument and Loue Token vnto his Flocke, hee hath regiſtred it by his owne Pen in this forme enſuinge, and ſealed it vp with his Blood. Foraſmuch then as he hath proued himſelfe no vain diſputer, no wethercocke, nor hipocrite, ſeeing hee

hath willinglye giuen his life for the Trueth, and in as much alſo as his loue and moſte conſtant chriſten Conſcience ſpeaketh vnto thee (gentle Reader) I beſeech thee for Chriſts ſake and thine owne, lend him thine indifferent hart and pacient hearing.

A BREEFE DECLARATION OF THE Lordes Supper.

MANY thinges confounde a weake memory: A fewe places wel weighed and perceiued, lighten the vnderstanding. Trueth is there to be searched, where it is certain to be had, though God doth speake the trueth by man, yet in mans woord, which God hath not reuealed to be his, a man may doubt without mistrust in God. Christe is the trueth of God reuealed vnto man from Heauen by God him self, and therefore in his woord the trueth is to be founde, which is to be embraced of al that be his. Christ biddeth vs aske, and we shall haue: search and we shall finde: knocke, and it shall be opened vnto vs. Therefore our Heauenly Father, the Author and fountain of al trueth, the bottomles Sea of al vnderstanding, send down we beseech thée, thy holy spirit into our harts, and lighten our vnderstanding with the beames of thy heauenly grace. We aske thée this, O mercifull Father, not in respect of our deserts, but for thy déere Sonne our Sautour Jesus Christs sake. Thou knowest, O heauenly Father, that the controuersie about the Sacrament of the blessed body and blood of thy déer Sonne our Sautour Jesu Christe, hath troubled not of late onlye the Churche of England, Fraunce, Germanie, and Italye, but also many yéers agoe. The fault is ours (no dout) therfore, for we habe deserued thy plague. But (O Lord) be mercifull, and releéue our miserie with some lighte of grace. Thou knowest (O Lord) how this wicked woorld rolleth vp and down, and reeleth to and fro, and careth not what thy will is, so it may abide in wealth. If trueth haue wealthe, who are so

The blessed Martirs praier.

stoute to defende the trueth, as they? But if Christes crosse be laid on truethes backe, then they banish away straight, as Ware before the fier. But these are not they, O Heauenly Father, for whome I make my moste moane, but for those silly ones, O Lord, which haue a zeale vnto thee: those I mean, which wold and wish to know thy wil, and yet are letted, holden backe, and blinded by the subtilties of Sathan and his ministers, the wickednes of this wretched worlde, and the sinfull lusts and affections of the flesh. Alas Lord, thou knowest that we bee of our selues but flesh, wherein there dwelleth nothing that is good. How then is it possible for man without thee (O Lord) to vnderstand thy trueth indeed? Can the naturall man perceiue the wil of God? (O Lord) to whom thou giuest a zeale of thee, giue them also (we beseech thee) the knowledge of thy blessed wil. Suffer not them (O Lord) blindely to be led for to striue against thee: as thou diddest those (Alas) which crucified thine owne Sonne, forgiue them (O Lord) for thy deere Sonnes sake, for they know not what they doo. They doo think (Alas, O Lord) for lack of knowledge, that they doo vnto thee good seruice euen when against thee they doo moste extremelye rage. Remember, O Lord, (we beseech thee) for whome thy Martyr Stephen did praye, and whome thyne holy Apostle Paule did so truelye and earnestlye loue: that for their saluation, he wished himself accursed for them. Remember (O heauenly Father) the prayer of thy deere Sonne, our Sauiour Christe vpon the crosse, when he saide vnto thee, O Father forgiue them, they know not what they doo. With this forgiuenes, O good Lord, giue me, I beseech thee, thy grace, so her briefly to set forth the sayings of thy Sonne our Sauiour Christe, and of his Euangelistes, and of his Apostles, that in this aforesaid controuersie, the lighte of the trueth, by the lantern of thy woorde, may shine vnto all them that loue thee.

Note.

Of the Lords last supper doo speak expressye the Euangelists, Mathew, Mark, and Luke: but none more plainelye nor more fully declareth the same, then doeth S. Paule, partely in the tenth Chapter, but specially in the xj. chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians. As Mathew and Mark doo agree much in woordes, so doo likewise Luke and S. Paule. But all iiij. no doubte, as they were all taught in one schoole, and inspired with one spirit, so taught they al one trueth. God grant vs to vnderstande it wel. Amen.

Mathew setteth foorth Christes Supper thus,

When euen was come, he sat down with the xij. &c. As they did eat, Jesus took bread and gaue thankes, brake it, and gaue it to the disciples, and saide: Take, eat: this is my body. And he took the cup

Math. 26.

and

and gaue thankes, gaue it to them, saying, Drink ye al of this: for this is my blood of the newe testament that is shed for many for the remission of sinnes. I say vnto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine tree, untill that daye, when I shall drink that newe in my fathers kingdome. And when they had sayed grace they went out.

Now Mark speaketh it thus.

And as they eate, Jesus took bread, blessed, and brake, and gaue to them and saied, take, eat, this is my body. And took the cup gaue thankes, and gaue it to them, and they all drank of it. And he said vnto them: This is my bloud of the new testament, which is shed for many. Verily I saye vnto you, I wil drink no more of the fruit of the vine, vntill that day, that I drink that newe, in the kingdome of God. Mark 14.

Here Mathew and Mark doo agree not only in the matter, but also almoste fully in the forme of woordes. In Mathew, gaue thankes. Mark hath one woorde, Blessed: which signifieth in this place al one. And where Mathew saith, Drink ye al of this, Mark saith, they al drank of it. And where Mathew saithe, of this fruit of the vine; Mark leaueth out the woord this, and saith, of the fruit of the vine.

Now let us see likewise, what agreement (in forme of woordes) is betweene S. Luke and S. Paule.

Luke writeth thus,

He took bread, gaue thankes, brake it and gaue it to them, saying; this is my body which is giuen for you, this doo in remembrance of me. Likewise also when they had supped, he took the Cup, saying, this Cup is the newe Testament in my bloud, which is shedde for you. Luke 22.

Saint Paule writeth foorth the Lords Supper thus,

The Lord Iesus, the same night, in the which he was betraied, took Bread, and gaue thankes and brake, and saide, take, eate, this is my body which is broken for you. This doo in remembrance of me. After the same maner he took the Cup, when supper was doon, saying, this Cup is the new testament in my bloud. This doo as often as yee shall drink it in remembrance of me. For as often as ye shall eate this breade, and drinke this cup, ye shall shewe the Lords deathe, vntill he come. 1 Cor. 11.

Here where S. Luke saith, which is given; Paule saith, which is broken. And as Luke addeth to the woordes of Paule spoken of the Cup which is shed for you, so likewise Paule addeth to the woordes thereof, this doo, as often as yee shall drinke it, in remembrance of me. The rest that followeth in S. Paule, both there and in the tenth Chapter, perteineth unto the right vse of the Lords Supper.

Thus the Euangelistes and S. Paule haue rehearsed the woordes and woorde of Christe, whereby he did institute and ordaine this holy.

holy Sacrament of his bodye and bloud to be a perpetuall remembrance vnto his comming againe of him selfe, I say that is of his body giuen for vs, and of his bloud shed for the remission of sinnes. But this remembrance which is thus ordained, as the author thereof is Christe, both God and Man, so by the almighty power of God, it far passeth al kindes of remembrances, that any other man is able to make either of him selfe, or of any other thinge. For whosoeuer receiueth this holy Sacrament thus ordeined in remembrance of Christe, he receiueth therwith either death or life. In this (I trust) we doo al agree. For S. Paule saith of the godly receiuers in the tenth Chapter of his first Epistle vnto the Corinthians, The Cup of blessinge, which we blesse, is it not the partaking or felowship of Christes bloud? And also saithe, the Breade which wee break (and meaneth at the Lords Table) Is it not the partaking or felowship of Christs body? Now the partaking of Christes body and of his bloud vnto the faithfull and godly, is the partaking or felowship of life and immortalitie. And againe of the bad and vngodly receiuers, S. Paule as plainly saith thus. He that eateth of this bread, and drinketh of this cup vnworthily, is gilty of the body and bloud of the Lord.

Note.

O how necessary then it is, if we loue life, and would eschue deathe, to trye and examine our selues, before we eate of this breade, and drink of this cup, for els assuredly, he that eateth and drinketh thereof vnworthilye, eateth and drinketh his own damnation, because he estæmeth not the Lords body, that is, he reuerenceth not the Lordes bodye with the honour that is due vnto him.

And that which was saide, that with the receite of the holye Sacrament of the blessed body and bloud of Christe is receiued of every one, good and bad, either life or death: it is not ment, that they whiche are dead before God, may heerby receiue life: or the liuinge before God, can heerby receiue death.

For as none is meete to receiue naturall food, wherby the naturall life is nourished, except he be borne and liue before: so no man can feed (by the receit of this holy Sacrament) of the food of eternall life, except he be regenerated and borne of God before. And on the other side, no man heer receiueth damnation whiche is not dead before. Thus hetherto without al doubt, God is my witnesse I saye so far as I doo knowe, there is no controuersie amonge them that be learned, in the Churche of England (concerninge the matter of this Sacrament) but al doo agree, whether they be new or olde, and to speak plain, and as some of them doo odiously cal either other, whether they be Protestantes, Papists, Pharisies or Gospellers. And as all doo agree hitherto, in the aforesaid Doctrine:

ctrine: ſo all doo deteſte, abhorre and condemne the wicked hereſie of the Meſſalonians which otherwiſe be called Eutichets, which ſaide that the holy Sacrament can neither doo no good nor harme. All do alſo condemne thoſe wicked Anabaptiſtes, which put no difference betweene the Lords Table and the Lords meat, and their owne. And becauſe charitie would, that we ſhould, (if it be poſſible, and ſo far as we may with the ſauegarde of good conſcience, and maintenance of the trueth) agree with all men: therfore me thinkes it is not charitablye doon to burthen any man (either newe or olde, as they call them) further, then ſuch doo declare themſelues, to diſſent from that we are perſwaded to be trueth, or pretend thertoo to be controuerſtes, where as none ſuch are in deed: and ſo to multiply the debate, the which the more it doth increaſe, the further it doth depart from the knitte, that the true Chriſtian ſhould deſire.

And again this is true, that trueth nother needeth nor will be maintained with lies. It is alſo a true prouerb, That it is euen ſinne to lye vpon the Deuil. For though by thy lye thou dooſt neuer ſo much ſpeak againſt the Deuil, yet in that thou lieſt in deed thou woorkeſt the Deuils woorke, thou dooſt him ſeruice, and takeſt the Deuils part. Now whether then they doo godlye and charitablye, which either by their Pen in Writting, or by their Woordes in Preaching, doo beare the ſimple people in hand, that thoſe which thus doo teach and beleue, doo go about to make the holye Sacrament (ordeined by Chriſte himſelfe) a thing no better then a peece of common Bread: or that doo ſaye, that ſuch doo make the holye Sacrament of the bleſſed bodye and blood of Chriſte, nothing els but a bare ſigne or a figure, to repreſent Chriſte none otherwiſe, then the Iuye buſhe doth repreſent the Wine in a Tauern, or as a vile perſon gorgiouſlye apparailed, maye repreſent a King or a Prince in a playe. Alas let men leaue lying, and ſpeak trueth euerye one, not only to his neighbour: but alſo of his neighboure, for wee are members one of an other ſaith Saint Paule. The controuerſie (no doubt) which at this daye troubleth the Church (wherin any mean learned man, either olde or newe, doeth ſtand in) is not, whether the holy Sacrament of the body and blood of Chriſte, is no better then a peece of common breade or no: or whether the Lords Table is no more to be regarded, then the Table of any earthly man or no: or whether it is but a bare ſigne or figure of Chriſte and nothing elſe or no. For all do graunt, that S. Paules woordes doo require, that the bread which we break, is the partaking of the body of Chriſte, and alſo doo graunte him that eateth of that bread, or drinketh of that cup vnwoorthely, to be giltye of the

What it is to lye.

The ſlunderous lyes of the Papiſts.

Lords death, and to eate and drinke his owne damnation, because he esteemeth not the Lords body. All doo graunt, that these woords of S. Paule, (when he saith: If we eate, it aduantageth vs nothing: or if wee eate not, wee want nothing therby) are not spoken of the Lords Table, but of other common meats.

Wherin the controuersie consisteth.

Thus then hetherto yet, we all agree. But now let vs see, wherin the dissention doth stand. The vnderstanding of it, wherin it cheefly standeth, is a step to the true searching foorthe of the trueth. For who can seeke well a remedye, if he knowe not before the disease? It is neither to be denied nor dissembled, that in the matter of this Sacrament there be diuers poyntes, wherin men (counted to be learned) cannot agree. As, whether there be any Transubstantiation of the bread, or no: any corporall and carnall presence of Christes substance, or no. Whether adoration (due only vnto God) is to be doon vnto the Sacrament or no? and whether Christes bodye be there offered in deed vnto the heauenly Father, by the Preest or no? and whether the euill man receiueth the naturall body of Christe or no. Yet neuertheles as in a man diseased in diuers partes, commonly the originall cause of such diuers diseases which is spred abroad in the body, doo come from one cheefe member, as from the stomache, or from the head, euen so all fiue aforesaid doo chiefly hange vpon this one question, which is, What is the matter of the Sacrament? whether is it the naturall substance of bread, or the naturall substance of Christes owne body? The trueth of this question truelye tried out and agreed vpon, no doubt shall cease the controuersie in all the rest. For if it be Christes owne natural body, borne of the Virgin: then assuredlye (seeing that all learned men in England so far as I knowe, bothe newe and olde, graunt there to be but one substance, then I say, they must needs graunt Transubstantiation: that is, a change of the substance of breade, into the substance of Christes bodye. Then also they must needs graunt the carnal and corporal presence of Christes body. Then must the Sacrament be adored with the honour due to Christe him selfe, for the vnitie of the two natures in one person. Then if the Preest do offer the Sacrament, he doeth offer indeed Christe him self. And finally the murtherer, the aduouterer, or wicked man receiuinge the Sacrament, muste needes then receiue also the naturall substance of Christes owne blessed bodye, bothe flesh and blood.

Now on the other side, if after the trueth shal be truely tried out, it shall be found, that the substance of breade is the naturall substance of the Sacrament, although for the change of the vse, office and dignitie of the bread, the bread indeed Sacramentally

is

is changed into the bodye of Chriſte, as the water in Baptiſme is ſacramentally changed into the fountaine of regeneration, and yet the natural ſubſtance therof remaineth al one, as was before: if I ſaye the true ſolucion of that former queſtion (wherupon all theſe controuerſies doo hang) be, that the natural ſubſtance of bread, is the materiall ſubſtance in the Sacrament of Chriſtes bleſſed body: then muſt it needes followe of the former propoſition (confeſſed of al that be named to be learned, ſo far as I doo knowe, in England) whiche is that there is but one materiall ſubſtance in the Sacrament of the body, and one only likewiſe in the Sacrament of the blood, that there is no ſuch thinge indeede and in truethe, as they call Tranſubſtantiation: for the ſubſtance of bread remaineth ſtil in the Sacrament of the body, then alſo the naturall ſubſtance of Chriſtes humain nature, which he tooke of the Virgin Mary is in Heauen, where it reigneth now in glory, and not heer incloſed vnder the forme of bread, then the godly honour, which is onely due vnto God the creator, may not be doon vnto the creature without idolatrye and ſacrilege, is not to be doon vnto the holye Sacrament.

Then alſo the wicked, I mean the impenitent murtherer, adulterer, or ſuche like, doo not receiue the naturall ſubſtance of the bleſſed body and blood of Chriſte. Finally, then dooth it followe, that Chriſtes bleſſed body and blood, which was once onlye offered and ſhed vpon the Croſſe, beinge anaplable for the ſinnes of all the whole worlde, is offered vp no more, in the naturall ſubſtance therof, neither by the Preeſt, nor any other thing. But heer before wee go any further to ſearch in this matter, and to wade (as it were) to ſearch and trye out (as we may) the trueth heerof in the Scripture, it ſhall doo well by the way to know whether they that thus make anſwere and ſolucione vnto the former principall queſtion, doo take away ſimply and abſolutely the preſence of Chriſtes bodye and blood, from the Sacrament ordeined by Chriſte, and dulye miniſtred according to his holy ordinance and inſtitution of the ſame. Vndoubtedly they doo deny that briefly, either ſo to ſaye, or ſo to meane. Heerof if any man doo or will doubt, the bookes which are written already in this matter of them, that thus doo anſwere, will make the matter plaine.

Now then will you ſaye, what kinde of preſence doo they graunt, and what doo they denye? Breefly they deny the preſence of Chriſts body in the naturall ſubſtance of his humain and aſſumpt nature, and graunt the preſence of the ſame by grace: that is, they affirme and ſaye, that the ſubſtance of the naturall bodye and blood of Chriſte is only remaining in Heauen, and ſo ſhall

be vnto the latter daye, when he shall come againe in glorye, (accompanied with the Angels of Heauen) to iudge both the quicke and the deade. And that the same naturall substance of the very body and blood of Christe, because it is united vnto the deuine nature in Christe the second person of the Trinitie. Therfore it hath not onely life in it selfe, but is also able to giue and doth giue life vnto so many as he or shal be partakers therof, that is, that to all that doo beleeue on his name, which are not borne of blood (as S. Iohn saith) or of the will of the flesh, or of the will of man, but are borne of God: though the self-same substance abide still in Heauen, and they for the time of their pilgrimage dwel heer vpon Earth: by grace I say, that is, by the life mencioned in Iohn and the properties of the same, meete for our pilgrimage heer vpon earth, the same body of Christe is heere present with vs. Euen as for example, wee saye, the same Sunne (which in substance) neuer remoueth his place out of the Heauens, is yet present heer by his beams, light and naturall influence, where it shineth vpon the earth. For Gods Woord and his Sacraments be (as it were the beams of Christ) which is sol iustitiæ, the Sunne of righteousnes.

Thus hast thou heard, of what sort or sect soeuer thou be, wherin dooth stand the principall stare and cheef poynte of all the controuersies, which doo properly pertain vnto the nature of this Sacrament. As for the vse therof I graunt there be many other thinges, wherof heer I haue spoken nothing at all. And nowe leaste thou iustely mightest complain, and say, that I haue in openinge of this matter doon nothing els, but digged a pitte, and haue not shut it vp again: or broken a gap, and haue not made it vp again: or opened the doore, and haue not closed it again: or els to call me what thou listest, as neuertheless dissembler, or what soeuer els thy lust and learning shall serue thee to name me woorse: Therfore heer now I will (by Gods grace) not only shortly, but so cleerely and plainly as I can make thee to knowe, whether of the aforesaid two answers to the former principall stare and cheef poynt dooth like me best: yea and also I will holde all those accursed, whiche in this matter that now so troubleth the Church of Christ haue of God receiued the keye of knowledge, and yet go about to shut vp the doores so that they themselues will not enter in nor suffer other that would. And as for mine owne parte, I consider but of late what charge and cure of soule hath bin committed vnto me, wherof God knoweth, how soon I shal be called to giue accounte: and also now in this worlde what perill and danger of the lawes concerning my life I am now in at this present time. What folly were it then for me,

now

now to dissemble with God, of whom assuredly I looke and hope by Christe to haue everlasting life? Seing that such charge and danger bothe before God and man, doo compasse mee in round about on every side: therfore God willing I will frankly and freelye utter my minde, and thoughe my bodye be captiue, yet my tung and my pen as long as I may shall frely set forth, that which undoubtedlye I am perswaded to be the trueth of Godes Woorde. And yet I will do it under this protestation, call me Protestant who listeth, I passe not therof. My protestation shall be thus: that my minde is and euer shal be (God willinge) to set foorth sincerelye the true sence and meaninge (to the beste of my understanding) of Godes most holy woorde, and not to decline from the same, either for feare of worldly danger, or els for hope of gaine.

I doo protest also due obedience & submission of my iudgemente in this my writing, and in all other mine affairs unto those of Christs Church, which be truly learned in Gods holy Woord, gathered in Christs Name and guided by his Spirit. After this protestation, I doo plainely affirme and say, that the second question and principall point, I am perswaded to be the very true meaning and sence of Gods holy Woord: that is, that the naturall substance of bread and wine is the true materiall substance of the holy Sacrament of the blessed body and blood of our Saiuour Christe: and the places of Scripture wherupon this my faith is grounded, be these, both concerning the Sacrament of the body and also the bloud. Answere to the cheef question.

Firste let us repete the beginninge of the institution of the Lords Supper wherin all the three Euangelists, and S. Paule almost in woords doo agree, saying that Iesus took bread, gaue thanks, brake, and gaue it to the Disciples sayinge: Take, eate, this is my bodye.

Heer it appeareth plainly, that Christe calleth very bread his body. For that which he took, was very bread. In this all men doo agree. And that which he took, after he had giuen thankes, he brake: and that which he took and brake, he gaue to his disciples: and that which he took, brake, and gaue to his Disciples he saide him selfe of it: This is my body. So it appeareth plainelye that Christ called very bread his body. But very bread canot be his bodye in very substance therof: therfore it must needs haue an other meaninge. Which meaninge appeareth plainelye what it is, by the next sentence that followeth immediatly, both in Luke and in Paule. And that is this.

Doo this in remembrance of me. Wher-upon it seemeth unto me to be euident, that Christe did take bread, and called it his bodye, for that he would therby institute a perpetuall remembrance of his

his body: specially of the singuler benefite of our redemtion, which he would then procure and purchase vnto vs by his bodye vpon the Crosse. But bread retaining still his owne very naturall substance, may be thus by grace, (and in a sacramental signification) his body: whereas els the very bread which he took, brake, and gaue them, could not be any wise his naturall bodye. For that were confusion of substances, and therfore the very wordes of Christe ioynes with the next sentence following, both enforceth vs to confesse the verye bread, to remaine still, and also openeth vnto vs, how that bread maye be and is thus by his deuine power his body, which was given for vs. But heere I remember I haue red in some writers of the contrarye opinion, which Christe did take, be blake. For say they, after his taking, he blessed it as Mark dooth speak. And by his blessing, he changed the natural substance of the bread into the natural substance of his body: and so although he took the bread, and blessed it, yet because in blessing he changed the substance of it, he brake not the breade, which then was not there, but only the forme therof.

Unto this obiection I haue two plain answers, both grounded vpon Gods woord. The one I will heer rehearse, the other answer I will differ, until I speak of the Sacrament of the blood. Mine answere heer is taken out of the plaine woords of S. Paule which dooth manifestly confound this fantastical inuention, first inuented (I ween) of Pope Innocentius, and after confirmed by the subtile sophister Duns, and lately renewed now in our daies, with an eloquent stile and much wittenesse of wit. But what can crafty inuention, subtilitye in sophismes, eloquence or finenesse of wit preuaile against the vnfallible Woorde of God? What needeth we to striue and contend what thinge we break, for Paule saieth, speaking vndoubtedly of the Lords Table: The bread (saieth he) which we break, is it not the partaking or fellowship of the Lords body?

Mar. Antho. Constan. Gardenar.

Wherupon it followeth, that after the thanks giuing it is bread which we break. And how often in the Acts of the Apostles is the Lords Supper signified by breaking of bread? They did persener (saith S. Luke) in the Apostles Doctrine, Communion, and breaking of bread. And they brake breade in euery house.

Acts 2. 10.

And again in an other place when they were come together to breake bread, &c. S. Paule which setteth foorth moste fully in his writtinge both the doctrine and the right vse of the Lords Supper, and the Sacramentall eating and drinkinge of Christs body and blood, calleth it fiue times bread, bread, bread, bread, bread.

The second reason.

The sacramentall bread is the misticall body, and so it is called in Scripture, 1 Cor. 10. as it is called the naturall body of Christe.

But

But Chriſts miſticall body is the congregation of Chriſtians. Now no man was ever ſo fond, as to ſay, that that ſacramentall breade is tranſubſtantiated and changed into the ſubſtance of the congregatione. Wherfore no man houlde likewiſe think, or ſaye, that the breade is tranſubſtantiated and changed into the naturall ſubſtance of Chriſtes humaine nature.

But my minde is not here to write what may be gathered out of Scriptures for this purpoſe, but onely to note heer breefly, thoſe which ſeem unto me, to be the moſt plaine places. Therfore contented to have ſpoken thus muche of the Sacramentall bread: I will nowe ſpeake a little of the Lords cup.

And this ſhall be my third Argument grounded upon Chriſtes owne woordes. The naturall ſubſtance of the ſacramentall Wine remaineth ſtill, and is the materiall ſubſtance of the Sacrament of the blood of Chriſte: Therfore it is likewiſe ſo in the ſacramentall Bread. The third Argument.

I know that he that is of a contrarye opinion, will denye the former parte of mine Argument. But I wil proove it thus by the plaine woordes of Chriſte himſelfe, both in Mathewe and in Marke. Chriſtes woordes are theſe: after the woordes ſaide upon the cup: I ſaye unto you, ſaith Chriſte, I will not drinke hencefoorthe of this fruite of the vine tree, untill I ſhall drink that new in my fathers kingdome. Heere note how Chriſte calleth plainly his cup the fruit of the vine tree. But the fruit of the vine is very naturall wine. Wherfore the naturall ſubſtance of the wine doothe remaine ſtill in the Sacrament of Chriſtes Blood.

And heer in ſpeaking of the Lords Cup: it commeth unto my remembrance the banitie of Innocentius his fantaſticall inuention, which by Paules woordes I did confute before, and heer did promiſe ſomwhat more to ſpeake, and that is this: if this Tranſubſtantiatione be made by this woorde, Bleſſed, in Mark ſaid upon the breade, as Innocentius that Pope did ſaye: then ſurely ſeing that woord is not ſaide of Chriſte neither in any of the Euangeliſtes nor in S. Paule upon the cup: There is no Tranſubſtantiatione of the Wine at all. For where the cauſe doth faile, there cannot follow the effect. But the ſacramental Bread and the ſacramental Wine doo both remain in their naturall ſubſtance alike, and if the one be not changed, as of the ſacramental Wine it appeareth evidently: then there is no ſuch Tranſubſtantiatione in nether of them both.

All that truſt and affirme this change of the ſubſtance of breade and wine into the ſubſtance of Chriſtes Bodye and Blood called Tranſubſtantiation: doo alſo ſay this change to be made by a certaine forme of preſcripte woordes, and none other. But what they The Papiſts affirme they wot not what.

they be that make the change, either of the one, or of the other: vndoubtedlye euen they that doo write moste finelye in these our daies, almost confesse plainely, that they can not tel. For although they graunt to certaine of the olde authors, as Chrisostom, and Ambrose: that these woordes This is my body, are the woordes of consecration of the Sacrament of the bodye: yet say they, these woordes may wel be so called, because they doo assure vs of the consecration therof, whether it be doon before these woordes be spoken or no.

Gardener to the 48. Objection.

But as for this their doubte, concerning the Sacrament of the bodye, I let it passe. Let vs now consider the woordes which pertain to the Cup. Lyra in first euident, that as Mathewe much agreeth with Mark, and likewise Luke with Paule muche agreeth herein in forme of woordes, so in the same forme of woordes in Mathew and Mark is diuers from that which is in Luke and Paule: the olde authors doo moste rehearse the forme of woordes in Mathewe and Marke: because I weene they seemed to them moste clere. But heer I would knowe, whether it is credibly or no, that Luke and Paule, when they celebrated the Lordes Supper with their congregations, that they did not not vse the same forme of woordes (at the Lords Table) which they wrote, Luke in his Gospell, and Paule in his Epistle. Of Luke, because he was a Phisition, whether some will graunt, that he might be a Preest or no, and was able to receiue the order of preesthood, which (they say) is giuen by the vertue of these woordes saide by the Bishop: Take thou authoritye to Sacrifice for the quick and the deade. I can not tell, but if they shoulde be so straight vpon Luke either for his craft, or els for lack of suche power giuen him by vertue of the aforesaid woordes: then I weene, both Peter and Paule are in danger to be deposed of their preesthood, for the craft either of Fishinge, which was Peters: or making of Tentes, which was Paules, were more vile, then the science of Phisicke.

Peter and Paule had no such preesthood as the Papists haue.

And as for those sacramentall woordes of the order of Preesthood, to haue authoritie to sacrifice both for the quicke and the deade, I weene Peter and Paule (if they were both a liue) were not able to prooue, that euer Christe gaue them such authoritie, or euer said any such woordes vnto them. But I will let Luke goe, and because Paule speaketh more for him selfe: I will rehearse his woordes: That (saith Paule) whiche I receiued of the Lord, I gaue vnto you. For the Lorde Jesus, &c. And so he setteth forth the whole institution and right vse of the Lordes Supper. Now seeing that S. Paule heer saith, that whiche he receiued of the Lord, he had giuen them, and that whiche he hath receiued and giuen them before by woord of mouth: now he rehearseth and writeth the same in his Epistle, is it credible that Paule woulde neuer vse this forme of woordes, vpon

the Lords cup, which (as he saith) he receaued of the Lord, that he had giuen them before, and now rehearseth in his Epistle? I trust no man is so farre from all reason, but he will graunt me, that this is not likely so to be.

Now then, if you graunt mee, that Paule did here the forme of words, which he writeth: Let us then rehearse and consider Paules words, which he saith, Christ spake thus upon the Cuppe.

This Cup is the New Testament in my blood, this doo: as often as ye shall drinke it in the remembrance of me.

Here I woulde knowe, whether that Christs words spoken upon the cup were not as mighty in worke, and as effectuall in signification to all intents, constructions, and purposes, (as all our Parliament men doo speak) as they were spoken upon the breade. If this be graunted, which thinge I think no man can deny: then further I reason thus. But the woorde (Is) in the woordes spoken upon the Lords breade doeth mightely signifie (say they) the change of the substance of that which goeth before it into the substance of that which followeth after, that is, of the substance of bread into the substance of Christes bodye, when Christe saith: This is my body. Now then if Christs woordes which are spoken upon the cup, which Paule here rehearseth be of the same might and power, both in woorking and signifying: then must this woord (Is) when Christe saithe: This Cup is the new Testament, &c. turne the substance of the cup into the substance of the new testament. And if thou wilt saye, that this woorde (Is) neither maketh nor signifieth any such change of the cup, Although it be said of Christe, that this cup is the new testament, yet Christ ment no such change as that. Marry sir, euen so saye I, when Christe said of the bread, which he took, and after thanks giuen, brake, and gaue them, saying: Take, eat, this is my body, he ment no more any such change of the substance of breade into the substance of his naturall body, then he ment of the change and transubstantiation of the cup into the substance of the newe Testament. And if thou wilt saye that the woord (Cup) here in Christs woords doeth not signifie the Cup it selfe, but the Wine or thing contained in the cup, by a figure called Metonymia, for that Christs woordes so ment, and muste needs be taken: thou saist very wel. But I pray thee by the way, here note two thinges, First that this woorde, Is, hath no suche strength or signification in the Lordes woords, to make or to signifie any transubstanciation. Secondly, that the Lords woords whereby he instituted the Sacrament of his blood: be plaine & figuratiue speach. How came then is it, that some so earnestly doo say, as it were an infallible rule, that in doctrine and in the institution of the Sacraments, Christe vsed no figurs, but all his woordes are to be

Note well the Papists errour confuted.

ſtrained to their proper ſignifications: when as heer what ſoeuer thou ſaieſt was in the cup, nother that nor the cup it ſelf, taking euerye woorde in his proper ſignification, was the new teſtament, but in vnderſtanding that which was in the cup by the cup that is a figuratiue ſpeache: yea and alſo thou canſt not deriſe or truly ſay of that whether ther thou ſaieſt it was wine or Chriſts bloud, to be the new teſtament without a figure alſo. Thus in one ſentence ſpoken of Chriſte, in the inſtitution of the Sacrament of his bloud, the figure muſt help vs twiſe. So vntrue it is, that ſome doo write, that Chriſte vſeth no figure in the doctrine of faith, nor in the inſtitution of his ſacraments. But ſome ſay, if we ſhall thus admit figures in doctrine: then ſhall all the articles of our faith, by figures and allegories ſhortly be transformed and vnlooſed. I ſay it is like fault, and euen the ſame, to denye the figure, where the place ſo requirethe to be vnderſtanded, as vainly to make it a figuratiue ſpeach, which is to be vnderſtanded in his proper ſignification.

Aug. de doc. Chriſtiana. li. 3. ca. 16.

The rules whereby the ſpeach is knowen, when it is figuratiue, & whereby it is none. S. Auguſtine in his booke. De doctrina Chriſtiana, giueth diuers learned leſſons, very neceſſary to be knowen of the ſtudents in Gods woorde. Of the which, one I wil rehearſe, which is this: If (ſaith he) the ſcripture dooth ſeeme to commaund a thing, which is wicked or vngodly, or to forbid a thing that charitie doth require: then know, ſaith he, that the ſpeach is figuratiue. And for example, he bringeth the ſaying of Chriſte, in the 6. chapter of S. Iohn. Except ye eate of the fleſhe of the ſonne of man, and drinke his blood: ye can not haue life in you. It ſeemeth to commaund a wicked or vngodly thing, wherfore it is a figuratiue ſpeech, commaunding to haue Communion and felowſhip with Chriſts paſſion, and deuoutly and holſomly to lay vp in memory, that his fleſh was crucified and wounded for vs.

Gardiner in his anſwers to the 161. & 226. obiection.

Note.

And heer I can not but maruell at ſome men, ſurely of much excellent ſimpleneſſe of wit, and of great eloquence, that are not aſhamed to write and ſaye, that this aforeſaide ſaying of Chriſte is after S. Auguſtine a figuratiue ſpeache indede: howbeit not vnto the learned, but to the vnlearned. Heere let any man that but indifferently vnderſtandeth the Latin tongue, reade the place in S. Auſtine: and if ye perceiue not clerly S. Auguſtins woordes, and mine to be contrarye, let me abide therof the rebuke.

This leſſon of S. Auguſtine I haue therfore the rather ſet foorthe, becauſe it teacheth vs to vnderſtand that place in Iohn figuratiuely. Euen ſo ſurely the ſame leſſon with the example of S. Auguſtins expoſitions therof, teacheth vs not onlye by the ſame, to vnderſtand Chriſtes woordes in the Inſtitution of the Sacrament both of his body and of his bloud figuratiuely, but alſo the very trewe meaning and vnderſtandinge of the ſame. For if to commaunde to

eate the flesshe of the sonne of man, and to drinke his bloode, seemeth to commaund an inconuenience and an vngodlines, & is euen so indeed, if it be vnderstanded as the woords doo stande in their proper signification: and therfore must be vnderstanded figuratiuelye and spirituallye, as S. Augustine dooth godly and learnedly interprete them: then surely Christe commaunding in his last Supper to eat his body and drinke his bloode, seemed to commaund in sound of woordes as grate and euen the same inconuenience and vngodlynesse, as did his woordes in the vj. of S. Iohn: and therfore must euen by the same reason, be likewise vnderstanded and expounded figuratiuely and spirituallye, as S. Augustine did the other: Wherunto that exposition of S. Augustine may seeme to be the more meete, for that Christe in his supper, to the commaundement of eating and drinkinge of his body and blood, addeth: Doo this in remembrance of me. Which woords surelye were the keye that opened and reuealed the spirituall and godlye exposition vnto Saint Augustine.

But I haue taried longer in settinge foorth the forme of Christes woords vpon the Lordes cup, written by Paule and Luke then I did intend to doo. And yet in speaking of the forme of Christs woords, spoken vpon his cup, commeth now to my remembrance the forme of woords vsed in the Latin Masse, vpon the Lords cup. Wherof I do not a little meruaile, what should be the cause, seeing the Latin Masse agreeeth with the Euangelists and Paule, in the forme of woords said vpon the breade why in the woordes saide vpon the Lordes cup, it differeth from them all, yea and addeth to the woordes of Christe spoken vpon the cup these woords, Misterium fidei, that is, the misterie of faithe, whiche are not red to be attributed vnto the Sacrament of Christes blood, nether in the Euangelists, nor in Paule, nor so far as I know in any other place of holye Scripture, yea and if it may haue some good exposition, yet why it should not be as wel added vnto the woordes of Christ vpon his Breade, as vpon his Cup, surelye I doo not see the misterie. And because I see in the vse of the Latin Masse, the Sacramente of the blood abused, when it is denyed vnto the laye people, cleane contrarye vnto Gods moste certain woorde: for why, I doo beseech thee, should the Sacrament of Christs blood be denied vnto the lay Christian more then to the Preeste? Did not Christe shed his blood aswel for the lay godlye man, as for the godlye Preeste? If thou wilt saye, yes that he did so. But the Sacrament of the blood is not to be receiued without the offeringe vp and sacrificinge therof vnto God the Father, both for the quicke and for the dead: and no man may make oblation of Christs blood vnto God but a Preest, and therfore the Preest alone, and that but in his Masse only, may receiue the Sacrament of the blood. And call you this, Maisters, Misterium fidei? The Lords Cup as the Preests say.

Alas, alas, I feare me, this is before God, Misterium iniquitatis, the misterye of iniquitie, such as S. Paule speaketh of, in his Epistle to the Thessalonians. The Lord be mercifull unto us, and bless us, lighten his countenance upon us, and be mercifull unto us. That we may know thy waye upon earthe, and amonge all people thy saluation.

2 Thes 2.

Prayer Psal. 67.

The Masse sacrifice iniurious to Christs passion.

This kinde of oblation standeth upon Transubstantiation his cosin germaine, and they doo grow both upon one ground. The Lord weede it out of his Vineyarde shortlye, if it be his blessed will and pleasure, that bitter root. To speake of this oblatione, howe muche is it iniurious unto Christes passion?

How? it can not, but with highe blasphemy and hainous arrogancye, and intollerable pryde, be claimed of any man, other then of Christe himselfe: how muche and how plainly it repugneth unto the manifest woordes, the true sence and meaning of holy scripture in manye places, especially in the Epistle to the Hebrewes: the matter it is so long, and other haue written in it at large, that my minde is nowe, not to intreate therof any further.

For only in this my scribling, I intend to search out and set foorthe by the Scriptures (according to Gods gracious gifte of my poore knowledge) whether the true sence and meaninge of Christes woordes in the institution of his holye supper, doo require any Transubstantiation, as they call it: or that the very substance of breade and wine doo remaine still in the Lordes Supper and be the materiall substance of the holy Sacramente of Christe our Sauiours blessed bodye and blood. Yet there remaineth one vaine Quidditi of Duns in this matter, the whiche because some that write now doo seeme to like it so well that they habe stripped him out of Dunces dusty and darke termes, and pricked him and painted him in freshe coloures of an eloquent stile: and may therfore deceaue the more, excepte the errour be warelye eschewed.

Gardener in the answere to the 15. obiection.

Duns saith in these woordes of Christe, This is my bodye, this pronowne demonstratiue, meaning the woorde (This) if ye will knowe what it dooth shewe or demonstrate, whether the bread that Christ took or no: he answereth no, but onely one thing in substance it pointerhe, wherof the nature or name it dooth not tell, but leaueth that to be determined and told by that which followeth the woord Is, that is by Prædicatum, as the Logician dooth speake: and therfore he calleth this pronowne demonstratiue. (This) Individuum vagum. that is, a wandring proper name, whereby we may poynte out and shewe anye one thing in substance, what thinge soeuer it be. That this imagination is vaine and untruely applyed unto these woordes of Christe, This is my bodye: it may appeare plainely in the woordes of Luke and Paule said upon the cup, conferred with the forme of woordes spoken upon the cup in Mathewe and Marke.

For

For as vpon the breade it is said of all, This is my bodye: so of Mathew and Mark, it is saide vpon the cup: This is my blood. Then if in the woords, This is my body, the woorde (This) be as Duns calleth it, a wandringe name to appointe and shewe sooth any one thing, whereof the name and nature it doothe not tell: so muste it be likewise in those woordes of Mathewe and Marke vpon the Lords cup This is my bloode. But in the woordes of Mathewe and Marke, it signifieth and poynteth out the same that it dooth in the Lords woords vpon the cup in Luke and Paule, where it is said: This cup is the new testament in my blood, &c. Therefore in Mathewe and Marke the pronown demonstratiue (this) doothe not wander to poynte onelye one thing in substance, not shewinge what it is, but telleth it plainelye what it is, no lesse in Mathewe and Marke vnto the eye then is doon in Luke and Paule, by putting too this woord (cup) dooth vnto the eye, and vnto the eare. For taking the cup and demonstrating or shewing it vnto his disciples, by this pronowne demonstratiue, (this) and saying vnto them, Drink ye all of this: it was then all one to saye. This is my blood, as to saye: This cup is my blood, meaninge by the cup as the nature of the speach dooth require: the thinge conteined in the cup. So likewise without al doubt, when Christe had taken breade, giuen thanks, and broken it, and giuing it to his disciples, said, Take: and so demonstrating and shewing that breade which hee had in his handes, to saye then, This is my body: and to haue saide, This bread is my body.

As it were all one, if a man lackinge a knife, and going to his Misters, would say vnto an other, whom he saw to haue two knyues. Sir I praye you lend mee the one of your knyues. Were it not now all one to answere him, Sir, holde I will lende you this to eat your meat, but not to open Misters withall: and holde, I will lend you this knife to eate your meat but not to open Oysters. This similitude serueth but for this purpose, to declare the nature of speach withall, where as the thinge that is demonstrated and shewed, is euidently perceiued, and openly knowen to the eye.

But O good Lord, what a wonderfull thing is it to see, how some men doo labour to teach, what is demonstrated and shewed by the pronowne demonstratiue (this) in Christes woordes when he saieth: This is my body: This is my blood: how they labour (I saye) to teache, what that (This) was then indeede, when Christe spake in the beginning of the sentence the woorde (This) before he had pronounced the reste of the woords, that folowed in the same sentence: so that their doctrine maye agree with their Transubstantiation: which indeed is the verye foundation, wherein al their errontous doctrine dooth stande. And heere the Transubstantiatours doo not agree amonge them selues, no more then they doo in

Gard. to the 130. Obiection. God makers agree not among them selues.

the woords which wrought the Transubstantiation, when Christe did first institute his Sacrament: wherin Innocentius a Bishop of Rome of the latter daies, and Duns (as was noted before) do attribute the woorke unto the woord (Benedixit) Blessed: but the rest for the moste parte, to Hoc est corpus meum. This is my body, &c. Duns therefore with his secte, because he putteth the change before must needs say, that this, when Christe spake it in the beginning of the sentence, was in deed Christes body. For in the change, the substance of bread did depart, and the change was now doon in Benedixit (saith he) that went before: and therefore after him and his that (this) was then indeed Christes body, though the woord did not impoort so muche but onely one thinge in substance: whiche substance after Duns (the breade beinge gone) must needs be the substance of Christs body. But they that put their Transubstantiation to be wrought by these woordes of Christe. This is my bodye: and doo say, that when the whole sentence was finished then this change was perfected and not before: they can not say, but yet Christes (this) in the beginning of the sentence before the other woords were fully pronounced, was bread in deed. But as yet the change was not doon, and so long the bread must needs remain, and so longe with the universall content of al transubstantiatours, the naturall substance of Christes bodye can not come: and therefore must their (this) of necessitye demonstrate and shewe the substance, which was as yet in the pronouncing of the first woord this by Christe, but bread. But how can they make and certifie Christs woords to be true, demonstrating the substance which in the demonstration is but bread, and say thereof, This is my body, thatis, as they tape the natural substance of Christs body: except they would say, that the verbe, Is, signifieth, is made, or, is changed into. And so then if the same verbe, Is, be of the same effect in Christs woords spoken upon the cup, and rehearsed by Luke and Paule: the cup or the wine in the Cup muste bee made or turned into the newe Testamente, as was declared before.

Gardener a neutrall or lack of both sides.

There be some among the Transubstantiatours, which walke so wililye and so warely between these two aforesaid opintons, allowing them both, and holding plainelye neither of them bothe, that me thinks they may be called Neutrals, Ambodexters, or rather suche as can shift on both sides. They play on both partes. For with the later, they doo allow the doctrine of the last sillable, which is that Transubstantiatione is doone by miracle in an instant, at the sound of the last sylla ble (um) in this sentence, Hoc est corpus meum. And they doo allowe also Duns his fantasticall imagination of Individium vagum, that demonstrateth as he teacheth in Christes woords, one thing in substance, then being (after his minde) the substance of the body of Christe. A mer-

A merbailous thinge, how one man can agrée with both theſe two, they being ſo contrary the one to the other. For the one ſaithe, the woorde this, demonſtrateth the ſubſtance of bread: and the other ſaith no not ſo, the bread is gone, and it demonſtrateth a ſubſtance whiche is Chriſtes body.

Gard. to the 4. obiection.

Luthe ſaith this third man, yée vnderſtand nothing at all. They agree well inough in the cheef poynte, whiche is the ground of all: that is, both doth agrée and beare witnes, that there is Tranſubſtantiation. They do agrée indeed in that concluſion: I graunt. But their proceſſe and doctrine therof do euen aſwell agrée togeather: as did the falſe witnes before Annas & Caiphas againſt Chriſt: or the two wicked Iudges againſt Suſanna. For againſte Chriſte the falſe witneſſes did agrée no doubt to ſpeak all againſte him. And the wicked iudges were both agréed to condemne poore Suſanna: but in examination of their witneſſes, they diſſented ſo far that al was found falſe that they went about, both that wherin they agréed, and alſo thoſe thinges, which they brought for their proofes.

God makers agree againſt the truth. Note.

Thus muche haue I ſpoken, in ſearchinge out a ſolucione for this principall queſtion, which was, what is the materiall ſubſtance of the holye Sacramente in the Lords ſupper? Now leaſt I ſhould ſeem to ſet by mine owne conceite, more then is meet: or leſſe to regard the doctrine of the old eccleſiaſticall writers, then is conuenient for a man of my poore learning and ſimple wit for to doo. And becauſe, alſo I am indeed perſwaded, that the olde eccleſiaſtical writers vnderſtood the true meaning of Chriſt in this matter: and haue both ſo truly and ſo plainly ſet it foorth in certain places of their writinges, that no man whiche will vouchſafe to reade them, and without preiudice of a corrupt iudgement will indifferently weigh them, & conſider their mindes none otherwiſe then they declare themſelues to haue ment: I am perſwaded (I ſay) that in reading of them thus no man can be ignorant in this matter, but he that will ſhut up his own eies, and blindfold himſelf. When I ſpeake of Eccleſiaſtical writers, I mean of ſuch as were before the wicked vſurpation of the ſee of Rome was growen ſo vnmeaſurably great, that not only with tirannical power, but alſo with corrupt doctrine, it began to ſubuert Chriſtes goſpell, and to turne the ſtate, that Chriſte and his Apoſtles ſet in the Church, vpſide down. For the cauſes aforeſaide, I will rehearſe certain of their ſayings: and yet becauſe I take them but for witneſſes and expounders of this doctrine and not as the authors of the ſame, and alſo for that now I will not be tedious I will rehearſe but fewe, that is three olde writers of the Greeke Church, and other three of the Latin Church, which do ſeem unto me to be in this matter moſt plaine.

The conſent of the olde authors.

The

The Greke Authors are Origen, Chrisostome and Theodoret. The Latin, are Tertulliane, S. Augustine and Gelasius. I know there can be nothinge so plaine, but the crafty wit furnished with eloquence can darken it, and wreste it quite from the true meaning to a contrary sence. And I know also that eloquence, craft, and fineness of wit hath gone about to bleare mens eies, and to stop their eares in the aforenamed writers, that men shoulde nother beare nor see, what those Authors do bothe write and teache so plainely, that excepte men shoulde be made both starke blinde and deafe: they can not but of necessitie, if they will reade and way them indifferently, both beare and see what they doo meane when eloquence, craftie, and fineness of wit habe done all that they can. Now let us heare the olde writers of the Greeke Church.

Origen. Origene, which lived about 1250. yeres agoe: a man for the excellency of his learninge so highlye esteemed in Christes Church, that he was counted and iudged the singular teacher in his time of Christs religion, the confounder of heresies, the schoolmaister of many godly matters, and an opener of highe misteries in scripture. He writing upon the 15 chapter of Saint Mathewes gospell, Ecclе Hist. Li. 6. Ca. 3. sateth thus: But if any thing enter into the mouth it goeth away in to the belly, and is auoided into the draught: Yea and that meat whiche is sanctified by the woord of God and praier, concerning the matter thereof, it goeth away into the belly, and is auoided into the draughte. But for the praier which is added vnto it, for the proportion of the faith, it is made profitable, makinge the minde able to perceive and see that which is profitable. For it is not the immateriall substance of breade, but the woord which is spoken vpon it, that is profitable to the man that eateth it not vnworthely. And this I mean of the Typical and Simbolical, that is, Sacramentall bodye. Thus far goe the woordes of Origene, where it is plaine, firste that Origene speaking here of the sacrament of the Lordes supper as the latte woordes doo plainely signifie, doth meane and teache, that the material substance therof is receiued, digested, and auoided, as the material substance of other bread and meats is, which couldernot be, if there were no materiall substance of bread at all, as the fantasticall opinion of Transubstantiation doth put. It is a wonder to see the answere of the Papistes to this place of Origen. In the disputations which were in this matter in the Parliamente house, and in both the vniuersities of Cambridge and Oxforde, they that defended Transubstantiation said, that this parte of Origen was but set forth of late by Erasmus, and therefore is to be suspected. But how bathe this their answere is, it appeareth plainly. For so maye all the good olde authors, which lay in olde libraries, and are set forth of late, be by this reason reiected, as Clement Alexandrinus, Theodoretus, Iustinus, Ecclesiastica historia, Nicephori, and other such. An other answere they had

The Papists obiection against Origene.

An other obiection.

had, saying that Origen is noted to haue erred in some poyntes, and therfore faithe is not to be giuen in this matter vnto him. But this answer well waighed dooth minister good matter to the cleere confutation of it selfe. For indeed we graunte, that in some poynts Origen did erre. But those errours are gathered out and noted both of S. Ierome and Epiphanius, so that his woordes (those errours excepted) are now so much the more of authoritie, that suche great learned men took paines to take out of him, whatsoeuer they thoughte in him to be written amis. But as concerninge this matter of the Lords Supper, nether they nor yet euer any other anciente Author did euer say, that Origen did erre.

Now because these two answers haue beene of late so confuted and confounded, that it is well perceiued, that they will take no place: therfore some whiche haue written since that time, haue forged two other answers, euen of the same moulde. The former whereof is, that Origen in this place spake not of the Sacramente of bread or wine of the Lords table, but of an other misticall meat: of the which S. Augustine maketh mencion to be giuen vnto them, that were taught the faithe, before they were baptised. But Origens owne woordes in two sentences before rehearsed being put togither, proue this answere vntrue. For he saith, that he meaneth of that figuratiue and misticall bodye, which profiteth them, that doo receiue it worthilye, alludinge so plainelye vnto S. Paules woordes spoken of the Lords Supper: that it is a shame for any learned man once to open his mouth to the contrarye. And that breade which S. Augustin speaketh of, he can not proue that any suche thing was vsed in Origens time. Yea and though that coulde bee proued, yet was there neuer breade in any time called a sacramentall body, sauing the sacramentall bread of the Lords table, which is called of Origen the typicall and symbolicall body of Christe. Gardener to the 166.

The second of the two new found answers, is yet moste monstrous of al other, which is this. But let vs graunt (say they) that Origen spake of the Lordes Supper, and by the matter therof was vnderstanded the materiall substance of bread and wine: what then say they? For thoughe the materiall substance was once gone and departed by reason of Transubstantiation, whils the formes of the bread and the wine did remaine, yet now it is no inconuenience to saye, that as the material substance did departe at the entring in of Christes body vnder th' aforesaid formes, so whan the said formes be destroyed and doo not remaine, then commeth again the substance of bread and wine. Gardener in the same place.

And this, say they, is very meet in this misterye, that that which began with the miracle, shall ende in a miracle.

If I had not red this fantasie I would scarcelye haue beleued, that any learned man euer would haue set foorth such a foolishe

fantaſie: which not onelye lacketh al ground, either of Gods woord, reaſon, or of any ancient writer, but alſo is clean contrary to the common rules of ſchoole diuinitie: which is, that no miracle is to be affirmed and put without neceſſitie. And although for their former miracle, which is their Tranſubſtantiation, they haue ſome colour, though it be but vaine, ſaying it is doone by the power and vertue of theſe woords of Chriſte, This is my body: yet to make this ſeconde miracle of returninge the materiall ſubſtance againe they haue no colour at al. Where els I pray them ſhew me, by what woords of Chriſte is the ſecond miracle wrought.

Thus ye may ſée, that the fleights and ſhifts which craftie and witie can inuente to wreſte the true ſence of Origen cannot take place. But now let vs heare an other place of Origen, and ſo we wil let him go.

Origen in the eleuen Homile Super Leuiticum ſaith: that there is alſo euen in the foure Goſpells, and not onelye in the olde Teſtament, a letter (meaninge a litterall ſence) whiche killethe. For if thou followe (ſaith he) the letter in that ſayinge: Excepte ye eate the fleſhe of the Sonne of Man, and drink his blood, &c.

This letter dooth kill. If in that place the letter dooth kil, wherin is commaunded the eating of Chriſtes fleſh: then ſurelye in thoſe woordes of Chriſte, wherein Chriſte commaundeth vs to eate his body, the literall ſence therof likewiſe dooth kil. For it is no leſſe crime but euen the ſame and all one in the literall ſence, to eate Chriſtes bodye, and to eate Chriſtes fleſhe. Wherefore if the one doo kill, excepte it be vnderſtanded figuratiuelye and ſpirituallye: then the other ſurelye doothe kill likewiſe. But that to eate Chriſtes fleſhe dooth kill ſo vnderſtanded, Origen affirmeth plainly in his woordes aboue rehearſed: Wherefore it cannot be iuſtly denied, but to eate Chriſtes bodye literally vnderſtanded, muſt néeds after him kill likewiſe.

The anſwere that is made to this place of Origen of the Papiſts, is ſo fooliſh, that it bewraieth it ſelf, without any further confutation. It is the ſame, that they make to a place of S. Auguſtin in his booke De doctrina Chriſtiana: Whereas S. Auguſtine ſpeaketh in effecte the ſame thinge that Origen dooth hér. The Papiſts anſwer is this: To the carnal man the literal ſence is hurtfull, but not ſo to the ſpirituall. As though to vnderſtande that in his proper ſence, which ought to be taken figuratiuely, were to the carnall man a dangerous perill: but to the ſpirituall man none at all.

Lib. 3. ca. 16.

Chriſoſtome.

Now to Chriſoſtome, whom I bringe for the ſecond writer in the Gréek Church, He ſpeaking againſt the vnholy vſinge of mans body, which after S. Paule ought to be kept pure and holy, as the very temple of the Holy Ghoſt, ſaith thus: If it be a fault (ſaith he) to tranſlate the holy veſſels, in the which is conteined not the trewe bodye of

In opere imperfect. ho. 9. in Matthe.

of Christe, but the mistery of the body, to private vses, how much more offence is it to abuse and defile the vessels of our body?

These be the woordes of Chrisostome, But I trowe that hêr many fowle shifts are deuised, to defeat this place. The Author saith: one is suspected. I answere: but in this place neuer fault was found with him, vnto these our dates. And whether this author was Iohn Chrisostome him selfe the Archbishop of Constantinople or no, that is not the matter. For of all it is graunted, that he was a writer of that age, and a man of great learninge: so that it is manifest, that this which he writeth was the receiued opinion of learned men in his dates.

Or els vndoubtedly in such a matter his sayinge shoulde haue bin impugned of some that wrote in his time, or neere vnto the same. Nay (saith an other) if this solucion wil not serue: we maye saye that Chrisostome did not speak of the vessels of the Lordes cup, or suche as were then vsed at the Lordes table, but of the vessels vsed in the Temple in the olde lawe. Gardener to the 198. obiection.

This answer wil serue no more then the other. For hêre Chrisostom speaketh of such vessells, wherin was that whiche was called the body of Christe, althoughe it was not the true body (saith he) of Christe, but the misterye of Christes bodye. Now of the vessels of the olde lawe the writers doo vse no such manner of phrase: for their sacrifices were not called Christes body. For then Christ was not but in shadowes and figures, and not by the Sacrament of his body reuealed. Erasmus, which was a man that coulde vnderstande the woordes and sence of the writers, although hee would not be seene to speak against this errour of Transubstantiatione, because he durste not: yet in this time declareth plainly that this sayinge of the writer is none otherwise to be vnderstanded.

Yet can I (saithe the third Papist) finde out a fine and subtil solucion for this place, and graunt all that yet is saide, both allowinge heere the writer, and also that he ment of the vessels of the Lordes Table. For (saith he) the body of Christe is not conteined in them, at the Lordes Table, as in a place, but as in a misterye. Is not this a pritty shifte, and a misticall solution? But by the same solution then Christs bodye is not in the Lordes Table, nor in the Preestes handes, nor in the pixe, and so is hee heere no where. For they will not saye, that he is either heere or there, as in a place. Gardener in the same place.

This answere pleaseth so well the maker, that he him selfe (after he had plaid with it a little while and shewed the fineneſſe of his wit and eloquence therein) is content to giue it ouer and saye: but it is not to be thought that Chrisostome would speak after this fineneſſe or subtiltie: and therfore he returneth againe vnto the second answere for his shoote anker, which is sufficiently confuted before. An other shorte place of Chrisostome I wil reherse, which (if any

indifferency may be heard) in plaine termes setteth forth the trueth of this matter.

Before the bread (saith Chrisostome ad Cesarium monachum) be halowed, we call it bread, but the grace of God sanctifying it by the meanes of the preeste it is deliuered now from the name of bread, and esteemed woorthy to be called Christs body, although the nature of bread tarry in it still.

Gardener to the 202. Obiection.

These be Chrisostoms woords: wherin I praye you, what can be said or thoughte more plaine against this errour of Transubstantiation, then to declare, that the breade abideth so still? And yet to this so plaine a place, some are not ashamed thus shamefully to elude it, saying: we graunt that nature of bread remaineth stil thus, for that it may be seene, felte, and tasted, and yet the corporal substance of the bread therfore is gone, leaste two bodies shoulde be confused together, and Christe shoulde be thought impanate.

What contrarietie and falsehood is in this answere, the simple man may easily perceiue. Is not this a plain contrariete to graunt that the nature of bread remaineth so still, that it may be seene, felte, and tasted: and yet to saye, the corporall substance is gon, to auoid absurditie of Christs impanation? And what manifest falshood is this, to saye or mean, that if the breade should remain still, then must followe the inconuenience of impanation?

As though the very breade coulde not be a Sacrament of Christs body (as water is of baptisme) excepte Christe shoulde vnite the nature of breade to his nature in vnitie of persone, and make of the bread, God.

Theodoret: Dial. 1.

Now let vs heare Theodoretus, which is the last of the three Greek Authors. He writeth in his dialogue Contra Eutichen, thus. He that calleth his naturall body, corn and breade: and also named himself a Vine tree: euen he the same hath honoured the Symboles (that is the sacramental signes) with the names of his body and blood, not changing indeed the nature it selfe, but adding grace vnto the nature.

What can be more plainly saide, then this, that this olde writer saieth? That although the Sacraments beare the name of the body and blood of Christe, yet is not their nature changed, but abideth still. And where is then the Papists Transubstantiation?

The same writer to the second dialogue of the same woorke against the aforesaide heretique Eutyches, writeth yet more plainly against this errour of Transubstantiation, if any thing can be saide to be more plaine. For hee maketh the heretike to speake thus against him that defendeth the true doctrine, whom he calleth Orthodoxus.

As the Sacramentes of the bodye and bloode of our Lorde are one thinge before the inuocation, and after the inuocation they be changed, and are made an other: so likewise the Lordes body (saithe the heretike)

like) is after the assumption or assention into heauen, turned into the substance of God: the heretike meaninge thereby, that Christe after his ascention, remaineth no more a man.

To this Orthodoxus answereth thus and saith to the heretike: Thou art taken (saith he) in thine owne snare. For those misticall Symbols or Sacraments after the sanctification doo not goe out of theire owne nature, but they tarrye and abide stil in their substance, figure, and shape, yea and are sensibly seene and groped to be the same they were before, &c.

At these woords the papistes doo startle: and to saye the trueth, these woordes be so plaine, so full, and so cleere, that they can not tell what to say, but yet they will not cease to go about to play the cuttles, and to caste their colours ouer them, that the trueth which is so plainly told, should not haue place.

This Author wrote (say they) before the determination of the Churche. As who would say, whatsoeuer that wicked man Innocentius the Pope of Rome determined in his congregationes with his monks and friers, that must be (for so Duns saith) holden for an article, and of the substance of our faith. Some doo charge this author that he was suspected to be a Nestorian, which thing in Calcedon Counsaile was tryed and proued to be false. But the foulest shift of al, and yet the best that they can finde in this matter, when none other will serue: is to say, that Theodoret vnderstandeth by the woord (substance) accidents, and not substance indeed. D. Moreman in the Conuocation house.

This glose is like a glose of a lawyer, vpon a decree, the text whereof beginning thus: Statuimus, that is, We decree. The glose of the Lawyer there (after many other pretty shifts there set forth) which he thinketh will not well serue to his purpose, and therfore at the laste to cleere the matter, he saith thus: after the minde of one Lawyer. Vel dic (saith he) Statuimus id est, abrogamus, that is: or expound we doo decree, that is, we abrogate or disanul. Is not this a goodlye, and worthye glose? who will not saye, but he is worthye in the lawe, to be reteined of counsaile, that can glose so well, and finde in a matter of difficultie, such fine shifts? And yet this is the lawe, or at least the glose of the lawe. And therfore who can tell, what perill a man may incurre to speak against it except he were a lawyer indeed, whiche can keep him self out of the briers what winde soeuer blowe. Distine. Ca. 4. Statuimus.

Hetherto ye haue heard three writers of the Greke Church, not all what they doo saye: for that were a labour too greate for to gather, and too tedious for the Reader: But one or two places of euery one, the which how plain, how ful, and how cleere they be against the errour of Transubstantiation, I refer it to the iudgement of the indifferent Reader.

And

And now I will likewise rehearse the sayings of other three old antient writers of the Latin Church, and so make an end.

Tertullian. And first I will begin with Tertullian, whom Ciprian the holy martyr so highly esteemed, that whensoeuer he would haue his book, he was wonte to saye: Giue vs now the Maister.

This olde writer in his fourthe booke against Martian the heretike, saith thus: Iesus made the bread, which he tooke, and distributed to his disciples, his body, saying: This is my body. That is to say (saith Tertullian) a figure of my body.

In this place it is plaine, that after Tertullians exposition, Christe ment not by callinge the breade his bodye, and the wine his blood, that either the breade was the naturall bodye, or the wine his natural blood, but he called them his bodye and blood, because he would institute them to be vnto vs Sacramentes: that is holye tokens and signes of his bodye and of his blood: that by them remembring and firmly beleeuing the benefites procured to vs by his body, which was torne and crucified for vs, and of his blood, which was shed for vs vpon the crosse: and so with thanks receiuing these holy Sacramentes, according to Christes institution, might by the same be spiritually nourished and fed to the increase of all godlines in vs heere in our pilgrimage and tourney wherein we walke vnto euerlasting life.

This was vndoubtedlye Christe our Sauiours mind, and this is Tertullians exposition.

Gardener to the 16. Obiection. The wrangling that the Papists doo make to elude this sayinge of Tertullian, is so far out of frame, that it euen werieth me to think on it.

Tertullian writeth heere (say they) as none hath doon hitherto before him.

This saying is too too manifeste false: for Origene, Hilarye, Ambrose, Basill, Grigorie, Nazianzene, Saint Augustine, and other old authors, likewise doo call the sacrament, a figure of Christes bodye. And where they say, that Tertullian wrote this, when he was in a heate of disputatione with an heretike, couering by all meanes to ouerthrow his aduersarye. As who saye, he would not take heed, what he did say, and specially what he would write in so high a matter so that he might haue the better hand of his aduersarye.

Is this credible to be true in any goodly wise man? How muche lesse then is it woorthye to be thought or credited in a man of so great a wit, learning, and excellency as Tertullian is woorthily esteemed euer to haue been?

Likewise this author in his first booke against the same heretike Martion, writeth thus: God did not reiect bread, which is his creature: for by it he hath made a representation of his body.

Note

Now I praye you, what is this to say that Christe hath made a representation (by bread) of his body, but that Christ had instituted and ordeined bread to be a Sacrament, for to represent unto us his body? Now whether the representatione of one thing by an other, requireth the corporal presence of the thinge which is so represented or no: everye man that hath understanding, is able in this poynte (the matter is so cleere of it selfe) to be a sufficient iudge.

The second doctour and writer of the Latin Churche, whose sayinges I promised to set foorth, is S. Augustine: of whose learning and estimation, I neede not to speake. For all the Church of Christe both hath and ever hath had him for a man of moste singuler learning, witte, and dilligence, both in setting foorth the true doctrine of Christes religion, and also in the defence of the same againste heretikes. Augustine.

This author as he hath written moste plenteously in other matters of our faith: so likewise in this argumente hee hath written at large in many of his woorkes, so plainly against this errour of Transubstantiation, that the Papists love leaste to heare of him of all other writers, partely for his authoritie, and partely because he openeth the matter more fully, then any other dooth.

Therfore I will rehearse more places of him then heertofore I have doon of the other. And first, what can be more plaine then that which he writeth upon the 89. Psalme, speaking of the Sacrament of the Lords body and blood: and rehearsinge (as it were) Christes woords to his Disciples after this manner.

It is not this bodye, whiche ye doo see, that ye shall eate, nother shall ye drinke this blood, which the Souldiers that crucifie me, shall spill or shed.

I doo commend vnto you a misterye or a Sacrament, which spiritually vnderstanded, shall give you life.

Now if Christe had no more naturall and corporall bodies, but that one which they then presently both heard and sawe, nor other natural blood, but that which was in the same body, and the which the souldiers did afterward cruelly shed upon the crosse: and nother this bodye nor this bloode was (by this declaration of S. Augustine) either to be eaten or dronken, but the misterie thereof spiritually to be understanded: then I conclude (if this saying and exposition of S. Augustine be true, that the mistery which the disciples should eate, was not the naturall body of Christ, but a misterye of the same spiritually to be understanded.

For as S. Augustine saithe in his 20. book Contra Faustum. Ca. 21. Christes flesh and blood was in the olde Testament promised by similitudes and signes of their sacrifices, and was exhibited indeed and in trueth vpon the crosse, but the same is celebrated by a Sacrament of remembrance vpon the aulter.

And

And in his booke, De fide ad Petrum. Ca. 19. he saithe, that in these sacrifices, meaning of the olde law, it is figuratiuely signified what was then to be giuen: but in this sacrifice it is euidentlye signified what is already giuen (vnderstanding in the sacrifice vpon the aulter) the remembrance and thanks giuing for the flesshe, which he offered for vs, and for the bloode which he shed for vs vpon the crosse: as in the same place and euidently there it may appeare.

In other euident and cleer place wher in it appeareth, that by the Sacramental bread, which Christe called his bodye, he ment a figure of his body. As vpon the 3 Psalme, where S. Augustine speaketh this in plain termes.

Christe did admit Iudas vnto the feaste, in the which he commended vnto his disciples the figure of his body.

This was Christes laste Supper before his passion, wherin he did ordeine the sacrament of his body, as all learned men do agree.

S. Augustine also in his 23 Epistle to Bonifacius teacheth, how Sacraments doo beare the names of the thinges whereof they be Sacraments, both in Baptisme, and in the Lords table, euen as we call euery good friday, the day of Christes passion: and euery Easter daye, the daye of Christes resurrection: when in very deed there was but one day wherin he suffred, and but one day wherin he rose. And why doo we then call them so, which are not so indeede, but because they are in like time and course of the yeere, as those days were, wherin those thinges were doone?

Was Christe, saith the saime Augustine, offered any more but once? And he offered himself. And yet in a Sacramente or representation not onelye euerye solemne feast of Easter, but also every daye to the People he is offered: so that he dooth not lye that saith: he is euery day offered.

For if Sacraments had not some similitude or likenes of those things, whereof they be Sacraments, they coulde in no wise be Sacraments: and for their similitudes or likenes: commonly they have the names of the things, whereof they be Sacraments. Therefore as after a certaine manner of speech, the Sacrament of Christs body, is Christs body; the Sacramente of Christes blood, is Christs bloode, so likewise the Sacrament of faith is faith.

Question 57. After this maner of speach, as S. Augustine teacheth in his questiones Super Leuiticum and Contra Adimantum, it is said in scripture, that vij. eares of corne be vij. yeeres, seuen Kine be seaven yeeres, and the rock was Christe: and blood is the soule, the which last saying (saith Saint Augustine) in his booke Contra Adimantum is vnderstanded to bee spoken by a signe or figure.

Cap 13.

Contra Maximinum. Li. Ca. 22. For the Lord himselfe did not sticke to saye. This is my body, when hee gaue the signe of his body. For we must not consider in Sacramentes, saithe S. Augustine in an other place, what they be; but what they doo signifie, or they be signs of things, beinge one thing in themselves, and yet signifying an nother thing.

For

For the heauenly bread (saith he) speakinge of the Sacramentall breade by some maner of speach is called Christes body, when in very deed it is the sacramente of his body, &c.

What can be more plaine, or more cleerly spoken, then are theis places of S. Augustine before rehearsed, if men were not obstinately bent to maintaine an vntrueth, and to receiue nothinge whatsoeuer dooth set it foorthe. Yet one place more of S. Augustine will I alleage, which is very cleare to this purpose, that Christes naturall body is in heauen, and not heer corporally in the Sacrament, and so let him departe.

In his 50. treatice, whiche he writeth vpon Iohn, he teacheth plainly and cleerly how Christe being both God and man, is both heer, after a certaine maner, and yet in heauen, and not heere in his naturall body and substance, which he took of the blessed virgin Mary: speaking thus of Christe and sayinge: By his deuine Maiestie, by his prouidence and by his vnspeakeable and inuincible grace that is fulfilled which he spake: Beholde, I am with you vnto the ende of the Worlde. But as concerning his flesh which hee took in his incarnatione, as touchinge that whiche was borne of the Virgine as concerninge that whiche was apprehended by the Iewes and crucified vpon a tree, and taken down from the crosse, lapped in linnen clothes, and buried, and rose againe, and appeared after his resurrection, as concerninge the fleshe, he said; ye shall not ever haue me with you. Why so? For as concerning his fleshe, he was conuersant with his Disciples xl. daies, and they accompanying, seeing and not following him, he went vp into heaven, and is not heere. By the presence of his deuine maiestie he did not departe; as concerninge the presence of his deuine maiestie, we have Christe ever with us; but as concerninge the presence of his flesh, he said truely to his disciples; ye shall not ever have me with you. For as concerninge the presence of his fleshe, the Church had him but a few daies; nowe it holdeth him by Faith, though it se him not.

Thus much S. Augustine speaketh repeating one thing so often and all to declare and teach, how we should vnderstand the maner of Christes beinge heere with vs: whiche is by his grace, by his prouidence, and by his deuine nature, and how he is absent by his naturall bodye whiche was borne of the virgin Mary, died, & rose for vs, and is assended into heauen, & there sitteth, as in the articles of our faith on the right hand of God, and thence (and from none other place saith S. Augustine) he shall come on the latter daye, to iudge the quick and the dead. At the which daye the righteous shall then lift up their heads, and the light of Gods trueth shal so shine: that falshood and errours shall be put into perpetuall confusion: righteousnes shall haue the vpper hand, and trueth that daye shall beare awaye the victorye, all th' enemies therof quite ouerthrowen, to be troden vnder foot for euermore.

O Lord, Lord, I beſeech thee haſten this day, then ſhalt thou be glorified with the glory due unto thy holy name, and unto thy deuine maieſty: and we ſhal ſing unto thee, in all ioy, and felicitie, laude and praiſe for euer more. Amen.

Here now would I make an end. For me thinks, S. Auguſtine is in this matter ſo full and plaine, and of that authoritye, that it ſhould not need after this his declaration, being ſo firmelye grounded upon Gods woorde, and ſo well agreeinge with the other ancient Authors, to bring in for the confirmation of this matter any moe: and yet I ſaide, I would alleage three of the Latin Church, to teſtifie the truethe in this cauſe. Nowe therefore the laſte of all ſhal be Gelaſius, whiche was a Biſhop of Rome, but one that was Biſhop of that See before the wicked uſurpation and tiranny therof ſpred and burſt out abroade into al the world. For this man was before Bonifacius, yea and Grigorye the firſte: in whoſe daies bothe corruption of doctrine and tirannicall uſurpation did chiefly growe, and had the upper hand.

Gelaſius. Gelaſius in an Epiſtle of the two natures of Chriſte, Contra Eutichen, writeth thus: The Sacraments of the body and blood of Chriſte, which we receiue, are godly things wherby and by the ſame wee are made partakers of the deuine nature, and yet neuertheleſſe the ſubſtance or nature of the bread and wine dooth not departe nor goe away.

Note theſe woordes I beſeeche you, and conſider, whether any thing can be more plainely ſpoken, then theſe woordes be againſt the errour of Tranſubſtantiatione, which is the ground and bitter root, wherupon ſpringe all the horrible errours before rehearſed.

Wherfore ſeing that the falſhood dooth appeare ſo manifeſtlye, and by ſo many waies ſo plainly, ſo clearly and ſo fullye, that no man needeth to be deceiued, but he that will not ſee, or will not underſtande: let us al that doo loue the trueth, embrace it, and forſake the falſhood. For he that loueth the trueth, is of God: and the lack of the loue therof is the cauſe why God ſuffereth men to fall into errours, and to periſh therin: yea and as S. Paule ſaieth, why he ſendeth unto them illuſions, that they beleue lyes, unto their own condemnation: becauſe (ſaithe he) they loued not the trueth. This trueth no doubte is Gods woord. For Chriſte Ioh. 17. him ſelf ſaith unto his father: Thy woord is trueth. The loue and light wherof almighty God our heauenly father giue us, and lighten it in our harts by his holy ſpirit through Jeſus Chriſte our Lorde, Amen.

Vincit Veritas.

Mr.

Mr. *FOX 2d* Volume of Acts and Monuments, *Edit. London*, 1684.

Lib. 9. pag. 106. *The Diſputation held at* Cambridge *before the Kings Commiſſioners*, June 20. 1549. *wherein Biſhop* Ridley *moderated.*

Lin. Well, yet once again to you, thus. The very true Body of Chriſt is to be honoured, but the ſame very true Body is in the Sacrament: *Ergo*, the Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament, is to be honoured. P. 106.

Rocheſt. Wellbeloved Friends and Brethren in our Saviour Chriſt, you muſt underſtand that this Diſputation, with other that ſhall be after this, are appointed to ſearch for the plain truth of the Holy Scriptures in theſe matters of Religion, which of a long Seaſon have been hidden from us by the falſe Gloſſes of the Church of *Rome*, and now in our days muſt be revealed to us Engliſhmen through the great Mercy of God principally; and ſecondarily, through the moſt gentle Clemency of our natural Sovereign Lord the Kings Majeſty, whom the living Lord long preſerve to reign over us in Health, Wealth and Godlineſs, to the maintenance of Gods holy Word, and to the extirpation of all blind Gloſſes of Men, that go about to ſubvert the Truth. Becauſe therefore, that I am one that doth love the Truth, and have profeſſed the ſame amongſt you; therefore I ſay, becauſe of conferring my mind with yours, I will here gladly declare what I think in this point now in Controverſy. Not becauſe this worſhipful Doctor hath any need of my help in diſſolving of Arguments propoſed againſt him; for as me ſeemeth, he hath anſwered hitherto very well, and Clerkly, according to the Truth of Gods Word. But now to the purpoſe, I do grant unto you (Mr. *Opponent*) that the old Ancient Fathers do record and witneſs a certain Honour and Adoration to be due unto Chriſts Body, but they ſpeak not of it in the Sacrament, but of it in Heaven, at the right hand of the Father, as holy *Chryſoſtome* ſaith, *Honour thou it, and then eat it*; but that Honour may not be given to

the outward ſign, but to the Body of Chriſt it ſelf in Heaven. For that Body is there only in a ſign virtually, by Grace, in the exhibition of it in Spirit, Effect and Faith, to the worthy receiver of it. For we receive virtually only Chriſts Body in the Sacrament.

Glin. How then (if it pleaſe your good Lordſhip) doth Baptiſm differ from this Sacrament? For in that we receive Chriſt alſo by Grace, and virtually.

Rocheſt. Chriſt is preſent after another ſort in Baptiſm, than in this Sacrament; for in that he purgeth and waſheth the Infant from all kind of Sin, but here he doth feed ſpiritually the receiver in Faith with all the merits of his bleſſed Death and Paſſion; and yet he is in Heaven ſtill really and ſubſtantially. As for Example, The Kings Majeſty, our Lord and Maſter, is but in one place, whereſoever that this Royal Perſon is abiding for the time, and yet his mighty Power and Authority is every where in his Realms and Dominions: So Chriſts real Perſon is only in Heaven ſubſtantially placed, but his might is in all things created effectually. For Chriſts Fleſh may be underſtood for the Power, or inward Might of his Fleſh.

Glin. If it pleaſe your Fatherhood, St. *Ambroſe*, and St. *Auguſtine* do ſay, That before the Conſecration, it is but very Bread, and after the Conſecration, it is called the very Body of Chriſt.

Madew. Indeed it is the very Body of Chriſt Sacramentally after the Conſecration, whereas before it is nothing but common Bread; and yet, after that, it is the Lords Bread; and thus muſt St. *Ambroſe*, and St. *Auguſtine* be underſtood.

Glin. The Bread after Conſecration doth feed the Soul, *Ergo*, The ſubſtance of common Bread doth not remain. The Argument is good, for St. *Ambroſe*, *De Sacramentis*, ſaith thus, After the Conſecration there is not the thing that Nature did form, but that which the bleſſing doth conſecrate. And if the Benediction of the Prophet *Elias* did turn the nature of Water; how much more then doth the Benediction of Chriſt here, both God and Man?

Madew. That Book of St. *Ambroſe* is ſuſpected to be none of his Works.

Rocheſt. So all the Fathers ſay.

Glin. I do marvel at that, for St. *Auguſtin* in his Book of Retractations maketh plain, that that was his own very Work.

Rocheſt.

Rocheſt. He ſpeaketh indeed of ſuch a Book ſo intituled, to St. *Ambroſe*, but yet we do lack the ſame Book indeed.

Glin. Well, let it then paſs to other mens Judgments. What then ſay you, to holy St. *Cyprian*, 1200 years paſt? Who ſaith, That the Bread which our Lord gave to his Diſciples, was not changed in form or quality, but in very nature, and by the Almighty word was made Fleſh.

Madew. I do anſwer thus, That this word Fleſh may be taken two ways, either for the ſubſtance it ſelf, or elſe for a natural property of a fleſhly thing. So that *Cyprian* there did mean of a natural Property, and not of fleſhly Subſtance. And contrariwiſe in the Rod of *Aaron*, where both the Subſtance, and alſo the Property was changed.

Glin. Holy St. *Ambroſe* ſaith, The Body there made by the mighty Power of Gods word, is the Body of the Virgin *Mary*.

Rocheſt. That is to ſay, That by the Word of God, the thing hath a Being, that it had not before, and we do conſecrate the Body, that we may receive the Grace and Power of the Body of Chriſt in Heaven, by this Sacramental Body.

Glin. By your Patience (my Lord) if it be a Body of the Virgin (as St. *Ambroſe* ſaith) which we do conſecrate as Miniſters by Gods holy Word, then muſt it needs be more than a Sacramental, or Spiritual Body; yea, a very Body of Chriſt indeed; yea, the ſame that is ſtill in Heaven, without all moving from place to place, unſpeakably, and far paſſing our natural Reaſon, which is in this Myſtery ſo captivate, that it cannot conceive how it is there, without a lively Faith to Gods word. But let this paſs. You do grant that this Bread doth quicken or give Life, which if it do, then it is not a natural Bread, but a ſuper-ſubſtantial Bread.

Rocheſt. So doth the effectual and lively Word of God, which for that it nouriſheth the Soul, it doth give Life; for the Divine Eſſence infuſeth it ſelf unſpeakably into the faithful Receiver of the Sacrament.

Glin. How then ſay you to holy *Damaſcene*, a *Greek* Author, who as one *Tritenius* ſaith, flouriſhed one thouſand years paſt; he ſaith thus, The Body that is of the holy Virgin *Mary* is joyned to the Divinity after the Conſecration in verity; and indeed, not ſo as the Body once aſſumpted into Heaven, and ſitting on the Fathers right Hand, doth remove from thence and cometh down at the Conſecration time; but that the ſame Bread and Wine

are

are substantially transumpted into the very Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. If (saith he) thou dost not know the manner how it is brought to pass, let it be enough to thee to believe that it is done by the Operation of the Holy Ghost; and we do know no more, but that the living Word of God is working, and Almighty; but the very manner how, is inscrutable to us; and no great marvel, saith he, for we cannot well express how the material Bread, Wine or Water are transumpted naturally into the same Body and Blood of the Receiver, and be become another Body than they were before. So saith this great Ancient Clerk; also this Shew-bread with Wine and Water, are changed by the coming of the Holy Ghost, into Christs Body and Blood, and they be not two Bodies there, but very one (of Christ) and the same.

Rochest First, I deny (Master Doctor) that *Damascene* was one thousand years past: Secondarily, I say, That he is not to be holden as an Ancient Father, for that he maintaineth in his Works, evil and damnable Doctrine, as the worshipping of Images and such like. Thirdly, I say, That indeed God by his holy Spirit, is the worker of that which is done in the Sacrament. Also I grant, that there is a Mutation of the common Bread and Wine spiritually into the Lords Bread and Wine, by the sanctifying of them in the Lords Word. But I deny that there is any Mutation of the Substances; for there is no other change there indeed, than there is in us, which when we do receive the Sacrament worthily, then are we changed into Christs Body, Bones and Blood, not in nature, but spiritually, and by Grace; much like as *Isaiah* saw the burning Coal, even so we see not there the very simple Bread, as it was before the Consecration; for an Union cannot be but of two very things. Wherefore, if we be joyned to Christ receiving the Sacrament, then there is no Adnihilation of Bread, which is when it is reduced to nothing, as it is in your feigned Transubstantiation.

Glin. So I perceive you would have me to grant that the Sacrament is but a Figure, which *Theophylactus* doth deny.

Rochest. You say Truth, he denieth it indeed to be a Figure; but he meaneth, that it is not only a Figure.

Glin. Whereas St. *Paul* saith, That we being many, are one Bread, he speaketh not, nor meaneth one material Bread, as you do here, *Ergo*, he speaketh of heavenly Bread. And holy *Chrysostome* upon *Matthew* saith, That the Paschal Lamb was a Figure, but the

the Myſtery is the verity. For the Diſciples would not have been offended to have drunk a figure of Chriſt's Blood, being well accuſtomed to figures. For Chriſt did not inſtitute a figure for a figure, but the clear verity inſtead of the figure, as St. *John* ſaith, Grace and Verity was given by Chriſt. Doſt thou ſee Bread? (ſaith *Chryſoſtome*) doth it avoid or paſs as other meats do which we receive? God forbid. *Ergo*, &c.

Madew. That ancient Clerk *Origen*, upon the 15th of St. *Matth.* ſaith thus, As touching that which is material in the Sacrament, it deſcendeth and iſſueth out as other nutriments do; but as concerning that which is celeſtial, it doth not ſo.

Glin. Chryſoſt. Homily 83. upon *Matthew* ſaith, That we cannot be deceived of Chriſt's Word, but our natural Senſes may be deceived in this point, very ſoon and eaſily; his ſaid words cannot be falſe, but our ſenſes be many times beguiled of their judgments. Becauſe therefore that Chriſt ſaid, *This is my body*, let us not at any hand doubt (ſaith he) but let us believe it, and well perceive it with the eyes of our underſtanding. And within a little after in that place he ſaith thus, It was not enough that he was become man, and afterwards was ſcourged for us, but alſo he did reduce and bring us to be as one body with him, not through Faith only, but in very deed alſo he maketh us his Body. And after that he ſaith, that theſe works are not of mans power. But the ſame things that he wrought in his laſt Supper, he now worketh alſo by his Precept to his right Miniſters, and we do occupy the place of the ſame Miniſters, but he it is that doth ſanctify and tranſumpt the creatures, he performeth ſtill the ſame.

Rocheſt. Mr. Doctor, you muſt underſtand, that in that place St. *Chryſoſtome* ſheweth us that Chriſt delivered to us no ſenſible thing at his laſt Supper.

Glin. Honourable Sir, by your patience I grant that he gave to his Diſciples no ſenſible thing in ſubſtance, but a thing inſenſible, his own precious Body and Blood, under the only kinds of Creatures. And truly, as it ſeemeth, *Theophylactus* beſt knew the meaning of *Chryſoſtome*, becauſe all Authors accept him as a faithful Interpreter of him. And he hath theſe ſame plain words Tranſelemented and Transformed. Alſo *Theophylactus Alexandrinus ſuper Marcum*, *Cyrillus*, and St. *Auguſtine* ſaith, That before the conſecration it is bread, but afterwards it is Chriſts very Body. In like manner St. *Auguſtine* upon the 33d *Pſalm* ſaith, That

in the laſt Supper Chriſt did bear himſelf in his own hands. Now every man may bear the figure of his body in his own hands, but St. *Auguſtin* ſaith it there for a Miracle. *Irenæus* in his fifth Book is of the ſame mind. And St. *Auſtin* ſaith, I do remember my words, &c. The Law and Figures were by *Moſes*, but the verity and Body came by Chriſt.

Rocheſt. Well, ſay what you liſt, it is but a figurative ſpeech, like to this, If you will receive and underſtand, he is *Elias*, for a property, but indeed he was not *Elias*, but *John* the Baptiſt. And ſo in this place Chriſt calleth it his Body, when it was very Bread. But better than the common Bread, becauſe it was ſanctified by the Word of Chriſt.

P. 109. *Langdale.* I will prove it by another means. Chriſt did ſuffer his moſt glorious paſſion for us really and ſubſtantially; *Ergo*, He is alſo in the Sacrament ſubſtantially. The Argument is good, becauſe that it is the ſame here that was there crucified for us; howbeit here inviſibly, indeed ſpiritually and ſacramentally, but there viſibly, and after a mortal and moſt bloody manner.

Rocheſt. Mr. *Langdale*, your Argument doth well conclude, in caſe that his Body were here in the Sacrament after ſuch a ſort as it was when it was betrayed: But that is not ſo; for he was betrayed and crucified in his natural body ſubſtantially and really in very deed; but in the Sacrament he is not ſo, but ſpiritually and figuratively only.

Langd. By your good Lordſhips favour that is not ſo, for he is there not figuratively, but verily and indeed by the power of his mighty Word, yea even his very own natural body under the Sacrament duly performed by the lawful Miniſter.

Madew, O ſay not ſo, for you ſpeak blaſphemy.

Langd. No, no Mr. Doctor, God forbid that either I or any man elſe, ſhould be noted of blaſphemy, ſaying nothing but the very plain truth, as in my Conſcience and Learning, I do no leſs.

Rocheſt. O Mr. *Langdale*, I wis it becometh you not here to have ſuch words.

Langd. If it like your good Lordſhip, I gave not the firſt occaſion of them, but only did refute that which I was unjuſtly burthened withall, as reaſon doth require, and it grieved me to hear it. He ſaith, if it pleaſe your Lordſhip, that there is a mutation or change of the Bread after it is Conſecrated; which if it be ſo, as I grant no leſs, then I would require of him, whether it be changed

changed in the Subſtance or in the Accidents, or elſe in both, or in nothing? No man can juſtly ſay, that there is a change into nothing. And all ancient Fathers do agree, that the ſame accidents are there ſtill after, that were before; nor doth any Doctor ſay, That there is any mutation both of the Subſtance and Accidents alſo; *Ergo*, The Subſtance of Bread is changed into ſome other thing that is there really preſent under the forms of Bread and Wine, which by Chriſts words muſt needs be his own Bleſſed Body.

Rocheſt. Sir, you are deceived greatly, for there is no change either of the Subſtances, or of the Accidents; but in very deed there do come unto the Bread other Accidents, inſomuch that whereas the Bread and Wine were not ſanctified before, nor holy, yet afterwards they be ſanctified, and ſo do receive then another ſort or kind of vertue which they had not before.

Rocheſt. Chriſt dwelleth in us by Faith, and by Faith we re- Pag. 118.
ceive Chriſt both God and Man, both in Spirit and fleſh; that is, this Sacramental eating is the mean and way whereby we attain to the Spiritual eating, and indeed for the ſtrengthening of us to the eating of this Spiritual food was this Sacrament Ordained. And theſe words, *This is my Body*, are meant thus, By Grace it is my true Body, but not my fleſhly Body, as ſome of you ſuppoſe.

Rocheſt. I acknowledg not his real Subſtance to be there, but Pag. 119.
the property of his Subſtance.

The Determination of Dr. Nicholas Ridley *Biſhop of* Rocheſter *upon* Pag. 120.
the Concluſions above prefixed.

There hath been an ancient cuſtom amongſt you, that after Diſputations had in your common Schools, there ſhould be ſome determination made of the matters ſo diſputed and debated, eſpecially touching Chriſtian Religion. Becauſe therefore it hath ſeemed good unto theſe worſhipful Aſſiſtants joyned with me in Commiſſion from the Kings Majeſty, that I ſhould perform the ſame at this time; I will by your favourable patience declare both what I do think and believe my ſelf, and what alſo other ought to think of the ſame. Which thing I would that afterward ye did with diligence weigh and ponder every man at home ſeverally by himſelf.

The principal Grounds, or rather Head-ſprings of this matter are ſpecially five.

The firſt is the Authority, Majeſty and Verity of Holy Scripture.

The ſecond is the moſt certain Teſtimonies of the Ancient Catholick Fathers, who after my judgment do ſufficiently declare this matter.

The third is the definition of a Sacrament.

The fourth is the abominable Hereſie of Eutiches *that may enſue of Tranſubſtantiation.*

The fifth is the moſt ſure belief of the Article of our Faith, He aſcended into Heaven.

The Firſt Ground.

This Tranſubſtantiation is clean againſt the words of the Scripture, and conſent of the ancient Catholick Fathers. The Scripture ſaith, *I will not drink hereafter of this fruit of the Vine,* &c. Now the fruit of this Vine is Wine. And it is manifeſt that Chriſt ſpake theſe words after the Supper was finiſhed, as it appeareth both in *Matthew*, *Mark*, and alſo in *Luke*, if they be well underſtood. There be not many places of Scripture that do confirm this thing, neither is it greatly material: for it is enough if there be any one plain teſtimony for the ſame. Neither ought it to be meaſured by the number of Scriptures, but by the Authority, and by the verity of the ſame. And the Majeſty of this verity is as ample in one ſhort ſentence of the Scripture, as in a thouſand.

Moreover, Chriſt took Bread, he gave Bread. In the *Acts*, *Luke* calleth it Bread. So *Paul* calleth it Bread after the Sanctification. Both of them ſpeak of breaking, which belongeth to the Subſtance of Bread, and in no wiſe to Chriſt's Body, for the Scripture ſaith, *Te ſhall not break a bone of him.* Chriſt ſaith, *Do ye this in my remembrance.* And again, *As often as ye ſhall drink of this Cup, do it in rememberance of me.* And our Saviour Chriſt in the ſixth of *John*, ſpeaking againſt the *Capernaites*, ſaith, *Labour for the meat that periſheth not.* And when they asked, *What ſhall we do that we may work the works of God?* He anſwered them thus, *This is the work of God, that ye believe in him whom he hath ſent.* You ſee how he exhorteth them to faith, *For Faith is that work of God.* Again, *This is that Bread which came down from Heaven.* But Chriſts Body came not down from Heaven. Moreover, *He that eateth my fleſh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. My fleſh* (ſaith he) *is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.* When they heard

heard this, they were offended. And whil'ſt they were offended, he ſaid unto them, *What if ye ſhall ſee the Son of Man aſcend up where he was before?* Whereby he went about to draw them from the groſs and carnal eating. *This Body*, ſaith he, *ſhall aſcend up into Heaven*, meaning altogether, as St. *Auguſtine* ſaith. *It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing. The words that I ſpeak unto you, are Spirit and Life*, and muſt be ſpiritually underſtood. Theſe be the Reaſons which perſwade me to incline to this Sentence and Judgment.

The Second Ground.

Now my *Second Ground* againſt this *Tranſubſtantiation*, are the Ancient Fathers a Thouſand Years paſt. And ſo far off is it, that they do confirm this Opinion of *Tranſubſtantiation*, that plain they ſeem to me, both to think and to ſpeak the contrary.

Dionyſius, in many places, calleth it *Bread*. The places are ſo manifeſt and plain, that it needeth not to recite them.

Ignatius to the *Philadelphians* ſaith, *I beſeech you, Brethren, cleave faſt unto one Faith, and to one kind of Preaching, uſing together one manner of Thanksgiving; For the Fleſh of the Lord Jeſus is one, and his Blood is one which was ſhed for us: There is alſo one Bread broken for us, and one Cup of the whole Church.*

Irenæus writeth thus: *Even as the Bread that cometh of the Earth, receiving God's Vocation, is now no more common Bread, but Sacramental Bread, conſiſting of two Natures, Earthly and Heavenly; even ſo our Bodies receiving the Euchariſt, are now no more corruptible, having hope of the Reſurrection.*

Tertullian is very plain, for he calleth it *a Figure of his Body*, &c.

Chryſoſtome writeth to *Cæſarius* the Monk, albeit he be not received of diverſe, yet will I read the place, to faſten it more deeply in your minds; for it ſeemeth to ſhew plainly the ſubſtance of Bread to remain. The words are theſe:

Before the Bread is ſanctified, we name it Bread: but by the grace of God ſanctifying the ſame, through the Miniſtry of the Prieſt, it is delivered from the Name of Bread, and is counted worthy to bear the Name of the Lord's Body, although the very ſubſtance of Bread notwithſtanding do ſtill remain therein, and now is taken not to be two Bodies, but one Body of the Son, &c.

Cyprian ſaith, *Bread is made of many Grains. And is that natural Bread, and made of Wheat? Yea, it is ſo indeed.*

The Book of *Theodoret* in *Greek* was lately printed at *Rome*,

which if it had not been his, it ſhould not have been ſet forth there, eſpecially ſeeing it is directly againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*: For he ſaith plainly, *That Bread ſtill remaineth after the Sanctification.*

Gelaſius alſo is very plain in this manner: *The Sacrament* (ſaith he) *which we receive of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, is a Divine Matter: By reaſon whereof, we are made partakers by the ſame of the Divine Nature, and yet it ceaſeth not ſtill to be the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine. And* certes, *the repreſentation and ſimilitude of the Body and Blood of Chriſt be celebrated in the action of the Myſteries*, &c. After this, he recited certain places out of *Auguſtine* and *Cyril*, which were not noted.

Iſichius alſo, confeſſeth that it is Bread.

Alſo the Judgment of *Bertram* in this matter is very plain and manifeſt: And thus much for the *Second Ground.*

The Third Ground.

The *Third Ground* is the Nature of the Sacrament, which conſiſteth of Three Things; that is, *Unity*, *Nutrition*, and *Converſion.*

As touching *Unity*, *Cyprian* thus writeth: *Even as of many Grains is made one Bread, ſo are we one myſtical Body of Chriſt.* Wherefore Bread muſt ſtill needs remain, or elſe we deſtroy the Nature of a Sacrament.

Alſo they that take away *Nutrition*, which cometh by Bread, do take away likewiſe the Nature of a Sacrament: For as the Body of Chriſt nouriſheth the Soul, even ſo doth Bread likewiſe nouriſh the Body of Man. Therefore they that take away the Grains, or the Union of the Grains in the Bread, and deny the Nutrition, or Subſtance thereof, in my judgment are Sacramentaries: For they take away the Similitude between the Bread, and the Body of Chriſt; for they which affirm *Tranſubſtantiation*, are indeed right *Sacramentaries* and *Capernaites.*

As touching *Converſion*, (that like as the Bread which we receive is turned into our Subſtance, ſo are we turned into Chriſt's Body) *Rabanus* and *Chryſoſtome* are Witneſſes ſufficient.

The Fourth Ground.

They who ſay, That Chriſt is carnally preſent in the *Euchariſt*, do take from him the Verity of Man's Nature. *Eutiches* granted the Divine Nature in Chriſt, but his Humane Nature he denied. So they that defend *Tranſubſtantiation*, aſcribe that to the Humane Nature, which onely belongeth to the Divine Nature.

The Fifth Ground.

The Fifth Ground is the certain perſwaſion of this Article of Faith, *He aſcended into Heaven, and ſitteth at the Right Hand*, &c.

Auguſtine ſaith, *The Lord is above, even to the end of the World; but yet the verity of the Lord is here alſo. For his Body wherein he roſe again muſt needs be in one place, but his verity is ſpread abroad every where.* Alſo in another place he ſaith, *Let the godly alſo receive that Sacrament, but let them not be careful* (ſpeaking there of the preſence of his Body.) *For as touching his Majeſty, his Providence, his inviſible and unſpeakible Grace, theſe words are fulfilled which he ſpake,* I am with you to the end of the World. *But according to the fleſh which he took upon him, according to that which was born of the Virgin, was apprehended of the Jews, was faſtned to a Tree, taken down again from the Croſs, lapped in Linnen Cloths, was buried and roſe again, and appeared after his Reſurrection, ſo ye ſhall not have me always with you; and why? becauſe, that as concerning his Fleſh, he was converſant with his Diſciples forty days, and they accompanying him, ſeeing him, but not following him, he went up into Heaven, and is not here, for he ſitteth at the right hand of his Father; and yet he is here, becauſe he is not departed hence, as concerning the preſence of his Divine Majeſty.*

Mark and conſider well what St. *Auguſtine* ſaith, *he is aſcended into Heaven, and is not here*, ſaith he. *Believe not them therefore which ſay that he is here ſtill in the Earth.*

Moreover, *Doubt not* (ſaith the ſame *Auguſtine*, *but that Jeſus Chriſt, as concerning the nature of his Manhood, is there from whence he ſhall come. And remember well and believe the Profeſſion of a Chriſtian man, that he aroſe from death, aſcended into Heaven, and ſitteth at the Right hand of his Father, and from that Place and none other* (not from the Altars) *ſhall be come to judge the quick and the dead, and he ſhall come, as the Angel ſaid, as he was ſeen to go into Heaven; that is to ſay, in the ſame form and ſubſtance, unto the which he gave immortality, but changed not Nature. After this form* (*meaning his Humane Nature*) *we may not think that it is every-where.* And in the ſame Epiſtle he ſaith, *Take away from the Bodies limitation of places, and they ſhall be no-where; and becauſe they are no-where, they ſhall not be at all.*

Vigilius ſaith, *If the Word and the Fleſh be both of one nature, ſeeing that the Word is every-where, why then is not the Fleſh alſo every-where? For when it was in Earth, then verily it was not in Heaven; and now when it is in Heaven, it is not ſurely in Earth. And it is ſo certain that it is*

not

not in Earth, that as concerning the ſame, we look for him from Heaven; whom as concerning the Word, we believe to be with us in Earth.

Alſo the ſame *Vigilius* ſaith, *Which things, ſeeing they be ſo, the courſe of the Scripture muſt be ſearched of us, and many Teſtimonies muſt be gathered, to ſhew plainly what a wickedneſs and ſacriledg it is to refer thoſe things to the property of the Divine Nature, which do only belong to the nature of the Fleſh; and contrariwiſe, to apply thoſe things to the nature of the Fleſh, which do properly belong to the Divine Nature.* Which thing the *Tranſubſtantiators* do, whilſt they affirm Chriſt's Body not to be contained in any one place, and aſcribe that to his Humanity, which properly belongeth to his Divinity, as they do who will have Chriſt's Body to be in no one certain place limited.

Now in the latter Concluſion concerning the Sacrifice, becauſe it dependeth upon the firſt, I will in few words declare what I think. For if we did once agree in that, the whole Controverſie in the other would ſoon be at an end. Two things there be which do perſwade me that this Concluſion is true; that is, certain places of the Scripture, and alſo certain Teſtimonies of the Fathers. Saint *Paul* ſaith *Hebrews* the 9th, *Chriſt being become an High Prieſt of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect Tabernacle not made with hands, that is, not of this building, neither by the Blood of Goats and Calves, but by his own Blood, entred once into the Holy Place, and obtained for us eternal Redemption,* &c. *And now in the end of the World he hath appeared once to put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf.* And again, *Chriſt was once offered to take away the ſins of many.* Moreover he ſaith, *With one offering hath he made perfect for ever thoſe that are ſanctified.* Theſe Scriptures do perſwade me to believe that there is no other oblation of Chriſt (albeit I am not ignorant there are many Sacrifices) but that which was once made upon the Croſs.

The Teſtimonies of the Ancient Fathers, which confirm the ſame, are out of *Auguſtine ad Bonif. Epiſt.* 23. Again, in his Book of 43 Queſtions, in the 41ſt Queſtion. Alſo in his 20th Book againſt *Fauſtus* the *Manichee*, Chap. 21. And in the ſame Book againſt the ſaid *Fauſtus*, Chap. 28. thus he writeth; *Now the Chriſtians keep a memorial of the Sacrifice paſt, with a holy Oblation and participation of the Body and Blood of Chriſt.*

Fulgentius, in his Book *De fide*, calleth the ſame Oblation a Commemoration. And theſe things are ſufficient for this time for a Scholaſtical Determination of theſe matters.

VOL.

VOL. III.

Biſhop Ridley's *Anſwer to the Three Propoſitions propoſed to him in the Diſputation at* Oxford, April 12. 1554.

I Received of you the other day, Right Worſhipful Mr. *Prolocutor*, and ye my Reverend Maſters, Commiſſioners from the Queens Majeſty and her Honourable Council, Three Propoſitions; whereunto ye commanded me to prepare againſt this day, what I thought good to anſwer concerning the ſame.

Now whilſt I weighed with my ſelf, how great a charge of the Lord's Flock was of late committed unto me, for the which I muſt once render an account to my Lord God, (and that how ſoon, he knoweth) and that moreover, by the Commandment of the Apoſtle *Peter*, I ought to be ready alway to give a Reaſon of the Hope that is in me, with Meekneſs and Reverence unto every one that ſhall demand the ſame. Beſides this, conſidering my Duty to the Church of Chriſt, and to your Worſhips, being Commiſſioners by Publick Authority, I determined with my ſelf to obey your Commandment, and ſo openly to declare unto you my mind touching the foreſaid Propoſitions; and albeit plainly to confeſs unto you the Truth in theſe things which ye now demand of me. I have thought otherwiſe in times paſt, than now I do, yet (God I call to record unto my Soul, I lye not) I have not altered my Judgment, as now it is, either by conſtraint of any Man or Laws; either for the dread of any dangers of this World; either for any hope of Commodity; but only for the love of the Truth revealed unto me by the Grace of God (as I am undoubtedly perſwaded) in his holy Word, and in the reading of the Ancient Fathers.

Theſe things I do rather recite at this preſent, becauſe it may happen to ſome of you hereafter, as in times paſt it hath done to me: I mean, if ye think otherwiſe of the matters propounded in theſe Propoſitions than I now do, God may open them unto you in time to come.

But howſoever it ſhall be, I will in few words do that which I think ye all look I ſhould do; that is, as plainly as I can, I will declare my Judgment herein. Howbeit of this I would ye were not ignorant, that I will not indeed wittingly and willingly

lingly ſpeak in any Point againſt Gods Word, or diſſent in any one jot from the ſame, or from the Rules of Faith, or Chriſtian Religion; which Rules that ſame moſt Sacred word of God preſcribeth to the Church of Chriſt, whereunto I now, and for ever ſubmit my ſelf and all my doings. And becauſe the matter I have now taken in hand is weighty, and ye all well know how unready I am to handle it accordingly, as well for lack of time, as alſo lack of Books; therefore here I proteſt, that I will publickly this day require of you, that it may be lawful for me concerning all mine Anſwers, Explications, and Confirmations, to add or diminiſh whatſoever ſhall ſeem hereafter more convenient and meet for the purpoſe, through more ſound Judgment, better Deliberation, and more exact Trial of every particular Thing. Having now by the way of Preface and Proteſtation ſpoken theſe few words, I will come to the Anſwer of the Propoſitions propounded unto me, and ſo to the moſt brief Explication and Confirmation of mine Anſwers.

Weſton. Reverend Mr. Doctor, concerning the lack of Books, there is no cauſe why you ſhould complain: What Books ſoever you will name, you ſhall have them; and as concerning the Judgment of your Anſwers to be had of your ſelf with further deliberation, it ſhall, I ſay, be lawful for you until Sunday next to add unto them what you ſhall think good your ſelf. My mind is, that we ſhould uſe ſhort Arguments, leſt we ſhould make an infinite proceſs of the thing.

Ridley. There is another thing beſides, which I would gladly obtain at your hands; I perceive that you have Writers and Notaries here preſent. By all likelihood our Diſputations ſhall be publiſhed; I beſeech you for Gods ſake let me have liberty to ſpeak my mind freely, and without interruption, not becauſe I have determined to protract the time with a ſolemn Preface, but leſt it may appear that ſome be not ſatisfied. God wot I am no Orator, nor have I learned Rhetorick to ſet Colours on the matter.

Weſton. Among this whole Company, it ſhall be permitted you to take two for your part.

Rid. I will chuſe two, if there were any here with whom I were acquainted.

Weſton. Here are two which Mr. *Cranmer* had yeſterday; take them if it pleaſe you.

Rid. I am content with them, I truſt they are honeſt men.

The

The Firſt Propoſition.

In the Sacrament of the Altar, by the virtue of God's Word ſpoken of the Prieſt, the Natural Body of Chriſt, born of the Virgin Mary, *and his Natural Blood is Really Preſent under the Forms of Bread and Wine.*

The Anſwer of N. Ridley.

In matters appertaining to God we may not ſpeak according to the ſenſe of Man, nor of the World. Therefore this Propoſition or Concluſion is framed after another manner of Phraſe or kind of Speech than the Scripture uſeth. Again it is very obſcure and dark by means of ſundry words of doubtful ſignification. And being taken in the ſenſe which the Schoolmen teach, and at this time the Church of *Rome* doth defend, it is falſe and erroneous, and plain contrary to the Doctrine which is according to Godlineſs.

The Explication.

How far the diverſity and newneſs of the Phraſe in all this firſt Propoſition, is from the Phraſe of the Holy Scripture, and that in every part almoſt, it is ſo plain and evident to any that is but meanly exerciſed in Holy Writ, that I need not now (eſpecially in this Company of Learned Men) to ſpend any time therein, except the ſame ſhall be required of me hereafter.

Firſt, There is a double ſenſe in theſe words (*by virtue of God's Word*) for it is doubtful what word of God this is; whether it be that which is read in the Evangeliſts, or in St. *Paul*, or any other. And if it be that which is in the Evangeliſts, or in St. *Paul*, what that is. If it be in none of them, then how it may be known to be God's Word, and of ſuch virtue that it ſhould be able to work ſo great a matter.

Again, There is a doubt of theſe words (*of the Prieſt*) whether no man may be called a Prieſt, but he who hath Authority to make a Propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and the dead; and how it may be proved that this Authority was committed of God to any man, but to Chriſt alone.

It is likewiſe doubted after what Order the Sacrificing Prieſt ſhall be, whether after the Order of *Aaron*, or elſe after the Order of *Melchiſedech*; for as far as I know, the Holy Scripture doth allow no more.

Weſton. Let this be ſufficient.

Rid. If we lack time at this preſent, there is time enough hereafter.

Weſton. Theſe are but evaſions or ſtarting holes; you conſume the time in vain.

Rid. I cannot ſtart from you, I am captive and bound.

Weſton. Fall to it, my Maſters.

Smith. That which you have ſpoken may ſuffice at this preſent.

Rid. Let me alone, I pray you, for I have not much to ſay behind.

Weſt. Go forward.

Rid. Moreover, there is ambiguity in this word *Really*, whether it be taken as the *Logicians* term it *tranſcendenter*, that is, moſt generally, and ſo it may ſignifie any manner of thing, which belongeth to the Body of Chriſt by any means; after which ſort we alſo grant Chriſt's Body to be really in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, (as in Diſputation, if occaſion be given, ſhall be declared) or whether it be taken to ſignifie the very ſame thing, having Body, Life, and Soul, which was aſſumed and taken of the Word of God, into the Unity of Perſon. In which ſenſe, ſith the Body of Chriſt is really in Heaven, becauſe of the true manner of his Body, it may not be ſaid to be here in the earth. There is yet a further doubtfulneſs in theſe words *under the forms of Bread and Wine*, whether the forms be there taken to ſignifie the only accidental and outward ſhews of Bread and Wine; or therewithal the ſubſtantial Natures thereof, which are to be ſeen by their qualities, and perceived by exterior ſenſes.

Now the Error and Falſeneſs of the Propoſition after the ſenſe of the *Roman* Church and Schoolmen, may hereby appear, in that they affirm the Bread to be Tranſubſtantiated, and changed to the Fleſh aſſumed of the Word of God; and that, as they ſay, by virtue of the Word, which they have deviſed by a certain number of words, and cannot be found in any of the Evangeliſts, or in S *Paul*; and ſo they gather that Chriſt's Body is really contained in the Sacrament of the Altar: Which Poſition is grounded upon the Foundation of the Tranſubſtantiation; which Foundation is monſtrous, againſt Reaſon, and deſtroyeth the Analogy or Proportion of the Sacraments; and therefore this Propoſition alſo, which is built upon this rotten Foundation, is falſe, erroneous, and to be counted as a deteſtable Hereſie of the Sacramentaries.

Weſton. We loſe time. *Ridley.* You ſhall have time enough.

Weſt. Fall to reaſoning. You ſhall have ſome other day for this matter. *Rid.* I have no more to ſay concerning my Explication. If you will give me leave, and let me alone, I will but ſpeak a word or two for my confirmation.

Weſton.

Weſton. Go to, ſay on.

The Confirmation of the aforeſaid Anſwer.

There ought no Doctrine to be eſtabliſhed in the Church of God, which diſſenteth from the Word of God, from the Rule of Faith, and draweth with it many abſurdities that cannot be avoided. Teſtimonie.

But this Doctrine of the firſt Propoſition is ſuch.

Ergo, It ought not to be eſtabliſhed and maintained in the Church of God.

The *Major* or firſt part of my Argument is plain, and the Minor or ſecond part is proved thus.

The Doctrine maintaineth a real, corporal, and carnal preſence of Chriſt's Fleſh, aſſumed and taken of the Word, to be in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that not by virtue and Grace only, but alſo by the whole Eſſence and Subſtance of the Body and Fleſh of Chriſt.

But ſuch a preſence diſagreeth from God's Word, from the Rule of Faith, and cannot but draw with it many abſurdities.

Ergo, The ſecond part is true.

The firſt part of this Argument is manifeſt, and the ſecond may yet futher be confirmed thus. ——

Weſton. Thus you conſume time, which might be better beſtowed on other matters. Mr. *Opponent*, I pray you, to your Arguments.

Smith. I will here reaſon with you upon *Tranſubſtantiation*, which you ſay is contrary to the Rule and Analogy of Faith. The contrary whereof I prove by the Scriptures and the Doctors. But before I enter Argumentation with you, I demand firſt, whether in the ſixth Chapter of *John* there be any mention made of the Sacrament, or of the Real Preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament?

Rid. It is againſt reaſon that I ſhould be impeached to proſecute that which I have to ſpeak in this Aſſembly, being not ſo long, but that it may be comprehended in few words.

Weſt. Let him read on.

Rid. Firſt of all, this Preſence is contrary to many places of the holy Scripture. Secondly, It varieth from the Articles of the Faith. Thirdly, It deſtroyeth and taketh away the Inſtitution of the Lord's Supper. Fourthly, It maketh precious t' ings common to prophane and ungodly perſons; for it caſteth that which is holy unto Dogs, and pearls unto Swine. Fifthly, It forceth men to maintain many Monſtrous Miracles without ne-

ceſſity and Authority of God's Word. Sixthly, It giveth occaſion to the Hereticks which erred concerning the two Natures in Chriſt, to defend their Hereſies thereby. Seventhly, It falſifieth the ſayings of the Godly Fathers; it falſifieth alſo the Catholick Faith of the Church which the Apoſtles taught, the Martyrs confirmed, and the Faithful (as one of the Fathers ſaith) do retain and keep until this day. Wherefore the 2*d* part of mine Argument is true. *The Probation of the Antecedent or former part of this Argument, by the Parts thereof.*

1. This carnal Preſence is contrary to the Word of God, as appeareth, *Joh.* 16. *I tell you the truth. It is profitable to you that I go away, for if I go not away, the Comforter ſhall not come unto you.* Act. 3. *Whom the Heavens muſt receive until the time of reſtoring of all things which God hath ſpoken.* Mat. 9. *The Children of the Bridegroom cannot mourn ſo long as the Bridegroom is with them.* But now is the time of mourning. Joh. 16. *But I will ſee you again, and your hearts ſhall rejoice.* Joh. 14. *I will come again and take you to my ſelf.* Mat. 24. *If they ſhall ſay unto you, Behold here is Chriſt, or there is Chriſt, believe them not,* &c.

2. It varieth from the Articles of the Faith, *He aſcended into Heaven, and ſitteth on the right hand of God the Father, from whence* (and not from any other place, ſaith St. *Auguſtine*) *he ſhall come to judg both the quick and the dead.*

3. It deſtroyeth and taketh away the Inſtitution of the Lord's Supper, which was commanded only to be uſed and continued until the Lord himſelf ſhould come. If therefore he be really preſent in the body of his fleſh, then muſt the Supper ceaſe: For a remembrance is not of a thing preſent, but of a thing paſt and abſent. And there is a difference between Remembrance and Preſence, and (as one of the Fathers ſaith) *A Figure is in vain where the thing figured is preſent.*

It maketh precious things common to prophane and ungodly Perſons, and conſtraineth men to confeſs many abſurdities. For it affirmeth, that Whoremongers and Murtherers, yea, and (as ſome of them hold opinion) that Mice, Rats and Dogs alſo may receive the very real and corporal Body of the Lord, wherein the fulneſs of the Spirit of Light and Grace dwelleth; contrary to the manifeſt words of Chriſt in ſix Places and Sentences of the 6*th* Chapter of St. *John.*

4. It confirmeth alſo and maintaineth that beaſtly kind of Cruelty of the *Anthropophagi*, that is, the Devourers of Man's Fleſh: for it

it is a more cruel thing to devour a quick Man, than to slay him.

Pie. He requireth time to speak Blasphemies. Leave your Blasphemies.

Rid. I had little thought to have had such reproachful words at your hands.

West. All is quiet. Go to your Arguments Mr. Doctor.

Rid. I have not many things more to say.

West. You utter Blasphemies with a most impudent face; leave off (I say) and get you to the Argument.

Rid. 5. It forceth men to maintain many monstrous Miracles, without any necessity and authority of God's Word. For at the coming of this presence of the Body and Flesh of Christ, they thrust away the Substance of Bread, and affirm that the Accidents remain without any Subject, and instead thereof they place Christ's Body without his qualities, and the true manner of a Body. And if the Sacrament be reserved so long until it mould, and Worms breed, some say that the Substance of Bread miraculously returneth again, and some deny it. Other some affirm, that the real Body of Christ goeth down into the Stomach of the Receivers, and doth there abide so long only as they shall continue to be good; but another sort hold that the Body of Christ is carried into Heaven, so soon as the forms of Bread be bruised with the Teeth. O Works of Miracles! Truly, and most truly, I see that fulfilled in these Men, whereof St. *Paul* prophesied, 2 *Thess.* 2. *Because they have not received the love of the truth, that they might be saved, God shall send them strong Delusions, that they should believe a Lye, and be all damned which have not believed the Truth.* This gross Presence hath brought forth that fond phantasie of Concomitance, whereby is broken at this day and abrogated the Commandment of the Lord for distributing of the Lord's Cup to the Laity.

6. It giveth occasion to Hereticks to maintain and defend their Errors; as to *Marcion*, who said that Christ had but a Phantastical Body; and to *Eutiches*, who wickedly confounded the two Natures in Christ.

7. Finally, It falsifieth the Sayings of the Godly Fathers, and the Catholick Faith of the Church, which *Vigilius*, a Martyr and grave Writer, saith, was taught of the Apostles, confirmed with the Blood of Martyrs, and was continually maintained by the Faithful until his time. By the Sayings of the Fathers, I mean of *Justin*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Eusebius*, *Emisenus*, *Athanasius*, *Cyril*, *Epiphanius*, *Hierome*, *Chrysostome*, *Augustine*, *Vigilius*, *Fulgentius*, *Bertram*,

tram, and others moſt ancient Fathers. All thoſe places, as I am ſure I have read, making for my purpoſe; ſo am I well aſſured that I could ſhew the ſame, if I might have the uſe of mine own Books, which I will take to me to do, even upon the peril of my life, and loſs of all that I may loſe in this World.

But now (my Brethren) think not becauſe I diſallow that Preſence which the firſt Propoſition maintaineth (as a Preſence which I take to be forged, Phantaſtical, and beſides the Authority of God's Word, perniciouſly brought into the Church by the *Romaniſts*) that I therefore go about to take away the true Preſence of Chriſt's Body in his Supper rightly and duly adminiſtred, which is grounded upon the Word of God, and made more plain by the Commentaries of the Faithful Fathers. They that think ſo of me, the Lord knoweth how far they are deceived; and to make the ſame evident unto you, I will in few words declare what true Preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper I hold and affirm, with the Word of God and the Ancient Fathers.

I ſay and confeſs with the Evangeliſt *Luke*, and the Apoſtle *Paul*, that the Bread on the which thanks are given, is the Body of Chriſt, in the remembrance of him and his Death, to be ſet forth perpetually of the Faithful until his coming.

I ſay and confeſs the Bread which we break, to be the Communion and partaking of Chriſt's Body, with the Ancient and the Faithful Fathers.

I ſay and believe that there is not only a ſignification of Chriſt's Body ſet forth by the Sacrament, but alſo that therewith is given to the Godly and Faithful the Grace of Chriſt's Body, that is, the food of Life and Immortality. And this I hold with *Cyprian*.

I ſay alſo with St. *Auguſtine*, that we eat Life, and we drink Life; with *Emiſene*, that we feel the Lord to be preſent in Grace; with *Athanaſius*, that we receive Celeſtial Food that cometh from above; the propriety of natural Communion, with *Hilary*; the nature of Fleſh, and Benediction which giveth life in Bread and Wine, with *Cyril*; and with the ſame *Cyril*, the virtue of the very Fleſh of Chriſt, Life and Grace of his Body, the property of the only begotten, that is to ſay Life, as he himſelf in plain words expounded it.

I confeſs alſo with *Baſil*, that we receive the myſtical Advent and coming of Chriſt, Grace and Virtue of his very Nature; the Sacrament of his very Fleſh, with *Ambroſe*; the Body by Grace, with *Epiphanius*; Spiritual Fleſh, but not that which was crucified,

crucified, with *Hierom*; Grace flowing into a Sacrifice, and the Grace of the Spirit, with *Chryſoſtom*; Grace and inviſible Verity, Grace and Society of the Members of Chriſt's Body, with *Auguſtine*.

Finally, with *Bertram*, (who was the laſt of all theſe) I confeſs that Chriſt's Body is in the Sacrament in this reſpect; namely, as he writeth, Becauſe there is in it the Spirit of Chriſt, that is, the power of the Word of God, which not only feedeth the Soul, but alſo cleanſeth it. But of theſe I ſuppoſe it may appear unto all men how far we are from that Opinion, whereof ſome go about falſly to ſlander us to the world, ſaying, we teach that the Godly and Faithful ſhould receive nothing elſe at the Lord's Table, but a Figure of the Body of Chriſt.

The Second Propoſition.

After the Conſecration, there remaineth no Subſtance of Bread and Wine, neither any other Subſtance, than the Subſtance of God and Man.

The Anſwer.

The ſecond Concluſion is manifeſtly falſe, directly againſt the Word of God, the Nature of the Sacrament, and the moſt evident Teſtimonies of the godly Fathers; and it is the rotten Foundation of the other two Concluſions propounded by you, both of the firſt, and alſo of the third. I will not therefore now tarry upon any further Explication of this Anſwer, being contented with that which is already added afore to the Anſwer of the firſt Propoſition.

The Firſt Argument for the Confirmation of this Anſwer.

It is very plain by the Word of God, that Chriſt did give Bread unto his Diſciples, and called it his Body.

But the Subſtance of Bread is another manner of Subſtance, than is the Subſtance of Chriſt's Body, God and Man.

Therefore the Concluſion is falſe.

The ſecond part of mine Argument is plain, and the firſt is proved thus.

The Second Argument.

That which Chriſt did take, on the which he gave Thanks, and the which he brake, he gave to his Diſciples, and called it his Body. *Da-*

But he took Bread, gave Thanks on Bread, and brake Bread. *ti-*

Ergo, The firſt part is true. *ſi.*

And it is confirmed with the Authorities of the Fathers, *Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Epiphanius, Hierom, Auguſtine, Theodoret,*

doret, *Cyril*, *Rabanus* and *Bede*; whoſe places I will take upon me to ſhew moſt manifeſt in this behalf, if I may be ſuffered to have my Books, as my requeſt is.

Bread is the Body of Chriſt. *Ergo.* It is Bread.

The Third Argument.

Ba- As the Bread of the Lord's Table is Chriſt's natural Body, ſo it is his myſtical Body.

ro- But it is not Chriſt's myſtical Body by Tranſubſtantiation.

co. *Ergo*, It is not his natural Body by Tranſubſtantiation.

The ſecond part of my Argument is plain, and the firſt is proved thus: As Chriſt, who is the Verity, ſpake of the Bread, *This is my Body which ſhall be betrayed for you*; ſpeaking there of his natural Body: even ſo St. *Paul*, moved with the ſame Spirit of Truth, ſaid, *We, though we be many, yet are we all one Bread and one Body, which be partakers of one Bread.*

The Fourth Argument.

We may no more believe Bread to be Tranſubſtantiate into the Body of Chriſt, than the Wine into his Blood.

But the Wine is not Tranſubſtantiate into his Blood:

Ergo, Neither is that Bread therefore Tranſubſtantiate into his Body.

The firſt part of this Argument is manifeſt, and the ſecond part is proved out of the Authority of God's Word in *Matthew* and *Mark*, *I will not drink of the fruit of the Vine*, &c. Now the fruit of the Vine was Wine which Chriſt drank, and gave to his Diſciples to drink. With this Sentence agreeth plainly the place of *Chryſoſtome* on the 20*th* Chapter of *Matthew*, as *Cyprian* doth alſo, affirming, That there is no Blood, if Wine be not in the Cup.

The Fifth Argument.

Ba- The words of Chriſt ſpoken upon the Cup, and upon the Bread, have like effect and working.

ro- But the words ſpoken upon the Cup have not virtue to Tranſubſtantiate.

co. *Ergo*, It followeth that the words ſpoken upon the Bread have no ſuch virtue.

The ſecond part of the Argument is proved; becauſe they would then Tranſubſtantiate the Cup, or that which is in the Cup, into the New Teſtament. But neither of theſe things can be done, and very abſurd it is to confeſs the ſame.

The Sixth Argument.

The Circumſtances of the Scripture, the Analogy and proportion of the Sacraments, and the Teſtimony of the faithful Fathers, ought to rule us in taking the meaning of the Holy Scripture touching the Sacrament. *Da-*

But the Words of the Lord's Supper, the Circumſtances of the Scripture, the Analogy of the Sacraments, and the Sayings of the Fathers, do moſt effectually and plainly prove a figurative ſpeech in the words of the Lord's Supper. *ti-*

Ergo, A figurative ſenſe and meaning is ſpecially to be received in theſe words, *This is my Body*. *ſi.*

The Circumſtances of the Scripture, *Do this in remembrance of me. As oft as ye ſhall eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup, ye ſhall ſhew forth the Lord's death. Let a man prove himſelf, and ſo eat of this bread, and drink of this cup. They came together to break Bread: and they continued in breaking of Bread. The Bread which we break*, &c. *For we being many, are all one Bread and one Body*, &c.

The Analogy of the Sacraments is neceſſary; for if the Sacraments had not ſome ſimilitude, or likeneſs of the things whereof they be Sacraments, they could in no wiſe be Sacraments. And this ſimilitude in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is taken three manner of ways.

1. The firſt conſiſteth in nourihing, as you ſhall read in *Rabanus*, *Cyprian*, *Auſtin*, *Irenæus*, and moſt plainly in *Iſidore* out of *Bertram*.

2. The ſecond in the uniting and joyning of many into one, as *Cyprian* teacheth.

3. The third is a ſimilitude of unlike things: Where, like as the Bread is turned into one Body; ſo we by the right uſe of this Sacrament, are turned through Faith into the Body of Chriſt.

The ſayings of the Fathers declare it to be a figurative ſpeech, as it appeareth in *Origen*, *Tertullian*, *Chryſoſtom in opere imperfecto*, *Auguſtin*, *Ambroſe*, *Baſil*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Hilary*, and moſt plainly of all, in *Bertram*. Moreover the ſayings and places of all the Fathers, whoſe names I have before recited againſt the aſſertion of the firſt Propoſition, do quite overthrow Tranſubſtantiation. But of all moſt evidently and plainly, *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Chryſoſtom* to *Cæſarius* the Monk, *Auguſtine* againſt *Adamantus*, *Gelaſius*, *Cyril*, *Epiphanius*, *Chryſoſtom* again on the 20th of *Matth*. *Rabanus*, *Damaſcene* and *Bertram*.

Here, Right Worſhipful Mr. Prolocutor, and ye the reſt of the Commiſſioners, it may pleaſe you to underſtand, that I do not lean to theſe things only, which I have written in my former Anſwers and Confirmations, but that I have alſo for the proof of that I have ſpoken,

whatſoever *Bertram*, a man Learned, of ſound and upright Judgment, and ever counted a Catholick for theſe Seven hundred years, until this our age, hath written. His Treatiſe, whoſoever ſhall read and weigh, conſidering the time of the Writer, his Learning, Godlineſs of life, the Allegations of the Ancient Fathers, and his manifold and moſt grounded Arguments, I cannot (doubtleſs) but much marvel, if he have any fear of God at all, how he can with good Conſcience ſpeak againſt him in this matter of the Sacrament. This *Bertram* was the firſt that pulled me by the Ear, and that firſt brought me from the common Error of the *Romiſh* Church, and cauſed me to ſearch more diligently and exactly both the Scriptures and the Writings of the old Eccleſiaſtical Fathers in this matter. And this I proteſt before the face of God, who knoweth that I lye not in the things I now ſpeak.

The Third Propoſition.

In the Maſs is the lively Sacrifice of the Church, propitiable and available for the ſins as well of quick as of the dead.

The Anſwer to this Propoſition.

I anſwer to this third Propoſition as I did to the firſt. And moreover I ſay, that being taken in ſuch ſenſe as the words ſeem to import, it is not only erroneous, but withal ſo much to the derogation and defacing of the Death and Paſſion of Chriſt, that I judge it may and ought moſt worthily to be counted wicked and blaſphemous againſt the moſt precious Blood of our Saviour Chriſt.

The Explication.

Concerning the *Romiſh* Maſs which is uſed at this day, or the lively Sacrifice thereof propitiatory and available for the ſins of the quick and the dead, the Holy Scripture hath not ſo much as one ſyllable.

There is ambiguity alſo in the name of Maſs: what it ſignifieth, and whether at this day there be any ſuch indeed as the Ancient Fathers uſed; ſeeing that now there be neither *Catecumeni* nor *Pœnitentes* to be ſent away.

Again, touching theſe words (*The lively Sacrifice of the Church*) There is doubt whether they are to be underſtood Figuratively and Sacramentally, for the Sacrament of the lively Sacrifice (after which ſort we deny it not to be in the Lord's Supper) or properly and without any figure; of the which manner there was but one only Sacrifice, and that once offered, namely upon the Altar of the Croſs.

Moreover, in theſe words (*as well as*) it may be doubted whether they be ſpoken in mockage as men are wont to ſay in ſport, of a fooliſh and ignorant perſon, that he is apt *as well* in conditions *as* in knowledg, being apt indeed in neither of them both.

There

There is alſo a doubt in the word *Propitiable*, whether it ſignify here that which taketh away ſin, or that which may be made available for the taking away of ſin; That is to ſay, whether it is to be taken in the active or in the paſſive ſignification.

Now the falſneſs of the Propoſition, after the meaning of the Schoolmen and the *Romiſh* Church, and Impiety in that ſenſe which the words ſeem to import, is this; that they leaning to the foundation of their fond Tranſubſtantiation, would make the quick and lively body of Chriſt's Fleſh (united and knit to the Divinity) to lye hid under the accidents, and outward ſhews of Bread and Wine. Which is very falſe, as I have ſaid before; and they building upon this foundation, do hold that the ſame Body is offered unto God, by the Prieſt in his dayly Maſſings, to put away the ſins of the quick and the dead; whereas by the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* it is evident that there is but one Oblation, and one true and lively Sacrifice of the Church offered upon the Altar of the Croſs, which was, is, and ſhall be for ever the propitiation for the ſins of the whole World: and where there is Remiſſion of the ſame, there is, ſaith the Apoſtle, no more offering for ſin.

Arguments confirming his Anſwer.

No Sacrifice ought to be done, but where the Prieſt is meet to offer the ſame. *Ce-*

All other Prieſts be unmeet to offer Sacrifice for ſin, but Chriſt alone. *la-*

Ergo, No other Prieſts ought to Sacrifice for ſin but Chriſt alone. *rent.*

The ſecond part of my Argument is thus proved.

No honour in God's Church ought to be taken where a man is not called as *Aaron*. *Fe-*

It is a great honour in God's Church to Sacrifice for Sin: *ri-*

Ergo. No man ought to Sacrifice for Sin, but only they who are called. *ſon.*

But only Chriſt is called to that honour.

Ergo, No other Prieſt but Chriſt ought to Sacrifice for Sin.

That no man is called to this degree of Honour but Chriſt alone, it is evident; For there are but two only Orders of Prieſthood allowed in the Word of God: Namely, the Order of *Aaron*, and the Order of *Melchiſedech*. But now the Order of *Aaron* is come to an end, by reaſon that it was unprofitable, and weak; and of the Order of *Melchiſedech* there is but one Prieſt alone, even Chriſt the Lord, who hath a Prieſthood that cannot paſs to any other.

An Argument.

That thing is in vain, and to no effect, where no neceſſity is wherefore it is done. *Ba-*

ro- To offer up any more Sacrifice Propitiatory for the quick and the dead, there is no neceſſity, for Chriſt our Saviour did that fully and perfectly once for all.

co. *Ergo*, To do the ſame in the Maſs, it is in vain.

Another Argument.

Fe- After that Eternal Redemption is found and obtained, there needeth no more daily offering for the ſame.

ri- But Chriſt coming an high Biſhop, *&c.* found and obtained for us Eternal Redemption.

o. *Ergo*, There needeth now no more daily Oblation for the Sins of the quick and the dead.

Another Argument.

Ca- All remiſſion of Sins cometh only by ſhedding of Blood.

meſ- In the Maſs there is no ſhedding of Blood.

tres. *Ergo*, In the Maſs there is no Remiſſion of Sins, and ſo it followeth alſo that there is no Propitiatory Sacrifice.

Another Argument.

In the Maſs the Paſſion of Chriſt is not in verity, but in a Myſtery repreſenting the ſame; yea even there where the Lord's Supper is duly miniſtred. But where Chriſt ſuffereth not, there is he not offered in verity: For the Apoſtle ſaith, *Not that he might offer up himſelf oftentimes, (for then muſt he have ſuffered oftentimes ſince the beginning of the World.)* Now where Chriſt is not offered, there is no Propitiatory Sacrifice.

Ergo, In the Maſs there is no Propitiatory Sacrifice. *For Chriſt appeared once in the latter end of the World to put ſin to flight by the offering up of himſelf. And as it is appointed to all men that they ſhall once dye, and then cometh the Judgment: even ſo Chriſt was once offered to take away the Sins of many. And unto them that look for him, ſhall he appear again without ſin unto ſalvation.*

Another Argument.

Da- Where there is any Sacrifice that can make the comers thereunto perfect, there ought men to ceaſe from offering any more Expiatory and Propitiatory Sacrifices.

ri- But in the New Teſtament there is one only Sacrifice now already long ſince offered, which is able to make the comers thereunto perfect for ever.

i. *Ergo*, In the New Teſtament they ought to ceaſe from offering any more Propitiatory Sacrifice.

Sentences of the Scripture tending to the ſame end and purpoſe, out of which alſo may be gathered other manifeſt Arguments for more confirmation thereof.

By the which will (ſaith the Apoſtle) *we are ſanctified by the offering up of the Body of Jeſus Chriſt once for all.* And in the ſame place; But this man, *after that he had offered one Sacrifice for ſin, ſitteth for ever at the Right hand of God*, &c. *For with one Offering hath he made perfect for ever them that are ſanctified, and by himſelf hath he purged our Sins.* I beſeech you to mark theſe words *(by himſelf:)* the which well weighed, will without doubt ceaſe all controverſie. The Apoſtle plainly denieth any other Sacrifice to remain for him that treadeth under his feet the Blood of the Teſtament, by the which he was made holy. Chriſt will not be crucified again, he will not his death to be had in deriſion. Heb. 10.

He hath reconciled us in the Body of his Fleſh. Mark, I beſeech you, he ſaith not in the Myſtery of his Body; but *in the Body of his Fleſh.* Col. 1.

If any man ſin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jeſus Chriſt the Righteous; and *he is the Propitiation for our Sins*; *not for ours only, but for the Sins of the whole World.* 1 John 2.

I know that all theſe places of the Scripture are avoided by two manner of ſubtil ſhifts: The one is, by the diſtinction of the bloody and unbloody Sacrifice; as tho our unbloody Sacrifice of the Church were any other than the Sacrifice of Praiſe and Thankſgiving, than a commemoration, a ſhewing forth, and a Sacramental Repreſentation of that one only bloody Sacrifice, offered up once for all.

The other is by depraving and wreſting the Sayings of the Ancient Fathers unto ſuch a ſtrange kind of ſenſe, as the Fathers themſelves indeed never meant. For what the meaning of the Fathers was, is evident by that which St. *Auguſtine* writeth in his Epiſtle to *Boniface*, and in the 83d Chapter of his Ninth Book againſt *Fauſtus the Manichee*, beſides many other Places; likewiſe by *Euſebius Emiſſenus*, *Cyprian*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Fulgentius*, *Bertram*, and others, who do wholly concord and agree together in this unity in the Lord, that the Redemption, once made in Verity for the Salvation of Man, continueth in full effect for ever, and worketh without ceaſing unto the end of the World; That the Sacrifice once offered cannot be conſumed; That the Lord's Death and Paſſion is as effectual, the vertue of that Blood once ſhed, as freſh at this day, for the waſhing away of ſins, as it was even the ſame day that it flowed out of the bleſſed Side of our Saviour: And finally, that the whole ſubſtance of our Sacrifice, which is frequented of the Church in the Lord's Supper, conſiſteth in Prayers, Praiſe, and giving of Thanks, and in remembring, and in ſhewing forth of that Sacrifice once offered upon the Altar of the Croſs; that the ſame might continually be had in reverence by Myſtery, which once

once only, and no more, was offered for the Price of our Redemption.

These are the things (right worshipful Mr. Prolocutor, and ye the rest of the Commissioners) which I could presently prepare to the answering of your three foresaid Propheſies, being destitute of all help in this shortness of time, sudden warning, and want of Books.

Wherefore I appeal to my first Protestation, most humbly desiring the help of the same (as much as may be) to be granted unto me. And because ye have lately given most unjust and cruel Sentence against me, I do here appeal (so far forth as I may) to a more indifferent and just censure and judgment of some other Superior, Competent and Lawful Judge, and that according to the approved state of the Church of *England*. Howbeit, I confess, I am ignorant what that is at this present, through the trouble and alteration of the state of the Realm. But if this Appeal may not be granted to me upon Earth, then do I fly (even as to my only Refuge and alone Haven of Health) to the Sentence of the Eternal Judge, that is, of the Almighty God, to whose most merciful Justice towards us, and most just Mercifulness, I do wholly commit my self, and all my Cause, nothing at all despairing of the Defence of my Advocate and alone Saviour Jesus Christ, to whom with the Everlasting Father, and the Holy Spirit, the Sanctifier of us all, be now and for ever all Honour and Glory. *Amen.*

P. 56. *Ridley.* Of Christ's Real Presence there may be a double understanding: If you take the Real Presence of Christ according to the Real and Corporal Substance which he took of the Virgin, that Presence being in Heaven, cannot be on the Earth also. But if you mean a Real Presence, *secundum rem aliquam quæ ad Corpus Christi pertinet: i. e.* according to something that appertaineth to Christ's Body, *certes* the Ascension and abiding in Heaven are no let at all to that Presence. Wherefore Christ's Body after that sort is here present to us in the Lord's Supper, by Grace, I say, as *Epiphanius* speaketh it.

P. 60. I grant the Bread to be converted and turned into the Flesh of Christ, but not by Transubstantiation, but by a Sacramental Conversion or turning. It is Transformed, saith *Theophylact* in the same place, by a Mystical Benediction, and by the accession or coming of the Holy Ghost unto the Flesh of Christ. He saith not, by expulsion, or driving away the Substance of Bread, and by substituting or putting in its place the Corporal Substance of Christ's Flesh. And where he saith, *It is not a Figure of the Body*, we should understand that saying, as he himself doth elsewhere add one, that is, it is no

naked

naked or bare Figure only. For Chriſt is preſent in his Myſteries; neither at any time, as *Cyprian* ſaith, doth the Divine Majeſty abſent himſelf from the Divine Myſteries.

And I alſo worſhip Chriſt in the Sacrament, but not becauſe he is included in the Sacrament: Like as I worſhip Chriſt alſo in the Scriptures, not becauſe he is really included in them. Notwithſtanding, I ſay, that the Body of Chriſt is preſent in the Sacrament, but yet Sacramentally and Spiritually, according to his Grace giving Life, and in that reſpect really, that is according to his Benediction, giving Life. *P.* 61.

Furthermore, I acknowledg gladly the true Body of Chriſt to be in the Lord's Supper in ſuch ſort as the Church of Chriſt (which is the Spouſe of Chriſt, and is taught of the Holy Ghoſt, and guided by God's Word) doth acknowledg the ſame. But the true Church of Chriſt doth acknowledg a Preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Lord's Supper, to be communicated to the Godly by Grace, and ſpiritually, as I have often ſhewed, and by a Sacramental Signification, but not by the Corporal Preſence of the Body of his Fleſh.

We worſhip, I confeſs, the ſame true Lord and Saviour of the world, which the Wiſe men worſhipped in the Manger; howbeit we do it in a Myſtery, and in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that in Spiritual Liberty, as ſaith *S. Aug. lib.* 3. *de Doct. Chriſtiana*, Not in carnal ſervitude; that is, we do not worſhip ſervilely the ſigns for the things; for that ſhould be, as he alſo ſaith, a part of a ſervile Infirmity; but we behold with the eyes of Faith him preſent after Grace, and ſpiritually ſet upon the Table; and we worſhip him who ſitteth above, and is worſhipped of the Angels; for Chriſt is always aſſiſtant to his Myſteries, as the ſaid *Auguſtine* ſaith. And the Divine Majeſty, as ſaith *Cyprian*, doth never abſent it ſelf from the Divine Myſteries; but this Aſſiſtance and Preſence of Chriſt, as in Baptiſm, it is wholly Spiritual, and by Grace, and not by any Corporal Subſtance of the Fleſh: Even ſo it is here in the Lord's Supper, being rightly, and according to the Word of God duly miniſtred. *P.* 65.

Ridley. My Proteſtation always ſaved, that by this mine Anſwer I do not condeſcend to your Authority, in that you are Legate to the Pope; I anſwer thus, *P.* 420.

In a ſenſe, the firſt Article is true, and in a ſenſe it is falſe; for if you take *really* for *vere*, for ſpiritually by Grace and Efficacy, then it is true that the Natural Body and Blood of Chriſt is in the Sacrament *vere & realiter*, indeed and really; but if you take theſe terms ſo groſly,

that

that you would conclude thereby a Natural Body, having Motion, to be contained under the Forms of Bread and Wine, *vere & realiter*, then really is not Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament, no more than the Holy Ghost is in the Element of Water in our Baptism.

Because this Answer was not understood, the Notaries wist not how to note it; wherefore the Bishop of *Lincoln* willed him to answer either Affirmatively or Negatively, either to grant the Article, or to deny it.

Rid. My Lord, you know that where any Equivocation (which is a word having two significations) is, except distinction be given, no direct Answer can be made; for it is one of *Aristotle*'s Fallacies, containing two Questions under one, the which cannot be satisfied with one Answer. For both you and I agree herein, that in the Sacrament is the very true and Natural Body and Blood of Christ, even that which was born of the Virgin *Mary*, which ascended into Heaven, which sitteth on the Right Hand of God the Father, which shall come from thence to judg the quick and the dead; only we differ in *modo*, in the way and manner of being; we confess all one thing to be in the Sacrament, and dissent in the manner of being there. I being fully by God's Word thereunto perswaded, confess Christ's Natural Body to be in the Sacrament indeed by Spirit and Grace, because that whosoever receiveth worthily that Bread and Wine, receiveth effectually Christ's Body, and drinketh his Blood; that is, he is made effectually Partaker of his Passion; and you make a grosser kind of being, enclosing a Natural, a Lively, and a Moving Body, under the shape or form of Bread and Wine. Now this difference considered, to the Question thus I answer, That in the Sacrament of the Altar is the Natural Body and Blood of Christ, *vere & realiter*, indeed and really for spiritually by Grace and Efficacy; for so every worthy Receiver receiveth the very true Body of Christ; but if you mean really and indeed, so that thereby you would include a lively and a moveable Body under the forms of Bread and Wine, then in that sense is not Christ's Body in the Sacrament really and indeed.

This Answer taken and penned of the Notaries, the Bishop of *Lincoln* proposed the second Question or Article. To whom he answer'd.

Rid. Always my Protestation reserved, I answer thus, That in the Sacrament is a certain Change, in that that Bread, which was before common Bread, is now made a lively presentation of Christ's Body, and not only a Figure, but effectually representeth his Body; that even as the Mortal Body was nourished by that visible Bread, so is the In-

ternal Soul fed with the Heavenly food of Chriſt's Body, which the eye of Faith ſeeth as the bodily eye ſeeth only Bread. Such a Sacramental mutation I grant to be in the Bread and Wine, which truly is no ſmall change, but ſuch a change as no mortal man can make, but only that *Omnipotency of Chriſt's Word.*

Then the Biſhop of *Lincoln* willed him to anſwer directly either Affirmatively or Negatively, without further Declaration of the Matter.

Then he Anſwered:

Ridley. That notwithſtanding the Sacramental Mutation of the which he ſpake, and all the Doctors confeſſed, the true Subſtance and Nature of Bread and Wine remaineth; with the which the Body is in like ſort nouriſhed, as the Soul is by Grace and Spirit with the Body of Chriſt. Even ſo in Baptiſm the Body is waſhed with the viſible Water, and the Soul is cleanſed from all filth by the Inviſible Holy Ghoſt, and yet the Water ceaſeth not to be Water, but keepeth the nature of Water ſtill. In like ſort in the Sacrament of the Lords-Supper the Bread ceaſeth not to be Bread.

Extracts from Biſhop *Poynets* Diallacticon.

Diallacticon Viri boni & literati de veritate, natura atque ſubſtantia corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti in Euchariſtia. Ad calcem Becæ Opuſculorum, Vol. II. *Par.* 2. *p.* 31. *Genevæ*, 1573. *f.*

I Will ſo divide the queſtion, that it may be briefly reduced to three heads. Firſt, I will ſhew that the true Body of Chriſt is given to the Faithful in the Sacrament; and that the words Nature *and* Subſtance, *are not to be rejected, but that the Ancients treating of this Sacrament did uſe them. In the next place, I will ſhew that there is a difference between the proper Body of Chriſt, and that which is preſent in the Sacrament, and that the Ancient Fathers thought ſo. Laſtly, I will ſhew, what manner of Body this is, which is received in this Myſtery,*

CAuſam ita partiri placuit, ut ſummatim ad tria capita revocetur. Primò oſtendam veritatem corporis Chriſti in Euchariſtia dari fidelibus; nec has voces Naturam atque Subſtantiam fugiendas eſſe, ſed Veteres de hoc Sacramento diſſerentes ita locutos fuiſſe. Deinde diſcrimen eſſe monſtrabo inter corpus Domini proprium, & illud quod ineſt in Sacramento; vetereſque Patres ita cenſuiſſe. Poſtremo cujuſmodi ſit hoc Corpus, quod accipitur in Myſterio, & cur eo nomine cenſeatur, indicabo,

and why it is called by that Name, according to the Doctrine of the ſame Fathers.

The Body of Chriſt is ſo called properly and improperly; properly, that Body which was taken of the Virgin. Improperly, as the Sacrament and the Church. That the Church is not properly the Body of Chriſt, cannot be doubted by any. It remains, that we now prove the ſame of the Sacrament.

It may eaſily be obſerved from what Chryſoſtom *writeth in this place, that that which Chriſt called his Body when he ſaid,* Take, eat, this is my Body; *and which he received together with his Apoſtles, is in another manner his Body, than is his very proper Body, which was fed with that other. This did eat, that was eaten, and each is called his Body, but in a different manner.*

He gave the Sacrament of his Body, and not the Body it ſelf viſibly conceived, that is, his viſible Body; which is referred to his proper Body. But this Body, wherever it is, is viſible.

It is to be obſerved, That the truth of the Lords Body may be ſpoken two ways, and ought to be underſtood two ways. For one verity of his Body is required in the Sacrament, another ſimply and out of the Sacrament.

As for what concerns our purpoſe, the very words of Cyprian *ſufficiently demonſtrate, how the Letter is not to be followed in thoſe things, which relate to this Myſtery; how far all carnal Senſe is to be removed, and all things to be referred to a ſpiritual Senſe; that with this Bread is preſent, the Divine Virtue, the* ſecundum eorundem Patrum ſententiam, *p.* 33, 34.

Corpus Chriſti dicitur propriè & impropriè; propriè, Corpus illud ſumptum ex Virgine; impropriè, ut Sacramentum & Eccleſia. Quod Eccleſia propriè Corpus Chriſti non ſit, nemini dubium eſt; de Sacramento reſtat, ut nunc idem Probemus, *p.* 38.

Non difficile eſt animadvertere ex his quæ ſcribit hoc loco Chryſoſtomus, aliter eſſe Corpus, quod Chriſtus ipſe Corpus ſuum appellavit, cum diceret, Accipite, edite; hoc meum eſt Corpus, quod ipſe quoque ſimul ſumebat cum diſcipulis; aliter ipſum Corpus proprium, quod illo altero veſcebatur. Hoc comedebat, illud comeſum eſt; & utrumque Corpus, ſed diverſa ratione, dicitur, *p.* 39.

Sacramentum videlicet Corporis (dedit) & non ipſum viſibiliter, ſive viſibile Corpus, quod ad proprium Corpus refertur. Hoc autem Corpus ubicunque eſt, viſibile eſt, *p.* 40.

Obſervandum eſt veritatem Dominici Corporis, dupliciter dici ac debere dupliciter accipi. Alia namque veritas Corporis requiritur in Myſterio, alia ſimpliciter & abſque Myſterio, *p.* 41.

Quod ad noſtrum inſtitutum attinet, ipſa Cypriani verba ſatis indicant, quam non ſequenda ſit litera in his quæ de hoc Myſterio dicuntur, quam procul arcendus eſt carnis Senſus, & ad Senſum ſpiritualem omnia referenda; huic Pani Divinæ Virtutis præſentiam adeſſe, Vitæ Æternæ

effect

effect of Eternal Life; that the Divine Eſſence is infuſed; that the Words are Spirit and Life; that a ſpiritual Precept is delivered; that this Body, this Fleſh and Blood, this Subſtance of the Body ought not to be underſtood after a common manner, nor according to the Dictates of human Reaſon; but is ſo named, thought and believed, becauſe of certain eminent Effects, Virtues and Properties, which are joyned to it, which are naturally found in the Body and Blood of Chriſt, to wit, that it feed and quicken our Souls, and prepare our Bodies to Reſurrection and Immortality.

Here it is to be remembred, that the words are ſpiritual, and ſpiritually to be underſtood; that it is indeed named Fleſh and Blood, but that this ought to be underſtood of the Spirit and Life, that is, of the lively Virtue of the Fleſh of our Lord, ſo that the Efficacy of Life is conferred on the external Signs.

When Theophylact *ſaid, That the Bread is not the Figure of our Lords Body, he means that it is not only (or a bare) Figure of it.*

See how Chryſoſtom *ſaith, That we are really, as I may ſo ſay, turned into the Fleſh of Chriſt. Yet who doth not ſee that this is a ſpiritual, not a carnal Converſion: So the Bread is really turned and tranſelementated into the Fleſh of Chriſt, but by a ſpiritual, not a carnal Converſion, inaſmuch as as the Bread obtains the Virtue of the Fleſh.*

How much better did Cyprian, Ambroſe, Epiphanius, Emyſenus, *and others ſpeak, who teach a like change to be performed in the Euchariſt, as is performed in Baptiſm, by which the external*

effectum, Divinam infundi eſſentiam verba Spiritum & vitam eſſe, ſpirituale documentum tradi, hoc Corpus, hunc ſanguinem, & carnem hanc ſubſtantiam Corporis, non communi more, nec ut humana ratio dictat accipi oportere, ſed ita nominari, exiſtimari, credi, propter eximios quoſdam Effectus, Virtutes, & Proprietates conjunctas, quæ Corpori & ſanguini Chriſti natura inſunt; nempe quod paſcat animas noſtras, & vivificet ſimul, & Corpora ad Reſurrectionem & Immortalitatem præparet, *p.* 46.

Hic cogitandum eſt verba ſpiritualia eſſe, & ſpiritualiter intelligenda; carnem quidem & ſanguinem nominari, ſed de Spiritu & Vitâ, id eſt, vivificâ Dominicæ carnis Virtute debere intelligi, & proinde vim Vitæ ſignis externis inditam eſſe, *Ibid.*

Theophylactus quum dicit (panem) non eſſe Figuram (Corporis Dominici) ſenſit non tantum Figuram eſſe, *p.* 47.

Ecce Chryſoſtomus dicit, realiter ut ita loquar, nos converti in carnem Chriſti, ſed ſpiritualem illam non carnalem Converſionem eſſe quis non videt? Ita reipsâ convertitur & tranſelementatur Panis in carnem Chriſti, ſed ſpirituali non carnali Converſione, quia Panis virtutem carnis aſſequitur, *p.* 48.

Quanto melius locuti ſunt Cyprianus, Ambroſius, Epiphanius, Emyſenus, & alii, qui ſimilem Commutationem in Euchariſtiâ cum ea quæ fit in Baptiſmo confirmant quâ fit ut

Signs remain the same, and by Grace acquire a new substance in the same manner.

The Exposition and Doctrine of Bertram, *concerning the Sacrament, ought in my Opinion to be diligently examined and embraced for two Reasons.*

That this may appear more manifestly, and be remembred the better, I thought it not unfit to subjoyn from what I have already taught, a certain Comparison between the two Bodies of Christ.

The proper Body of Christ hath Head, Breast, and distinct Members; the mystical Body hath not. The proper Body hath Bones, Veins and Nerves; the mystical Body hath not.

That is organical; this is not.

That is not a Figure; this is a Figure of the proper Body. That is human and corporeal by its Nature; this is Heavenly, Divine, and Spiritual.

The matter of that is not subject to Corruption; the material part of this is Bread, and is corrupted.

That is contained in one place; this is present, wheresoever the Sacrament is celebrated, but not, as in a place.

That is not the Sacrament of another Body; this the Sacrament of another.

That was taken of the Body of the Virgin Mary, *and was once created; this is not taken of the Virgin, but is created daily by the mystical Benediction potentially.*

That is a natural Body, this supernatural. Lastly, That is simply, properly and absolutely his Body; this in a certain respect only and improperly.

signa maneant eadem, & per gratiam novam acquirant substantiam similiter, *p.* 49.

Cujus ego viri (Bertrami) Expositionem & de Sacramento viam disputandi duas ob causas diligenter expendendam & amplectendam arbitror, *p.* 52.

Quod ut magis appareat, & memoriâ reponatur, non inutile fore putavi, ex his quæ supra memoravimus, ἀνάκρισιν quandam per collationem subjungere.

Corpus Christi proprium habet caput, pectus, membra distincta, Corpus mysticum non habet. Corpus proprium habet Ossa, Venas, Nervos, mysticum non habet.

Illud organicum est; hoc non est.

Illud Figura non est; hoc est Figura proprii Corporis. Illud naturâ suâ humanum & corporeum est; hoc Cœleste, Divinum, Spirituale.

Illius materia Corruptioni non est obnoxia; hujus pars materialis Panis est, & corrumpitur.

Illud uno loco continetur; hoc, ubicunque Sacramentum celebratur, adest, at non ut in loco.

Illud non est Sacramentum alterius Corporis; hoc Sacramentum est alterius.

Illud de Virginis Mariæ corpore sumptum, semel creatum est; hoc de Virgine non sumitur sed quotidie per Benedictionem mysticam potentialiter creatur.

Illud naturale Corpus est; hoc supernaturale. Denique illud simpliciter, hoc secundum quid; illud propriè & absolute, hoc improprie Corpus est, *p.* 52, 53.

Non

Nor is it enough here, if we flee one way of carnally underſtanding it, and fall upon another. For he who literally underſtands the eating of the Fleſh of Chriſt, and as altho it were a proper Speech, he is a carnal Capernaite; whether he imagine it to be properly done this way, or that way. For it is probable that all the Capernaites underſtood Chriſt carnally, but not all the ſame way.

For it is not therefore to be accounted a Spiritual ſenſe, becauſe they ſay the Fleſh of Chriſt is there inviſibly preſent. For if they mean his proper Fleſh, we do not therefore not eat it carnally, becauſe we do not ſee it.

Now in this Sacrament the ancient Fathers obſerved two things, for each of which it might deſervedly be called and eſteemed the Body of Chriſt; but more eſpecially when it comprehends both. For the Bread is juſtly called his Body, as well becauſe it is the figure of his true Body, as becauſe it hath the lively vertue of it conjoyned to it, much more; but moſt eſpecially, becauſe it comprehendeth both.

It is therefore to be admired, what they mean, who will not ſuffer it to be called a figure, nor acknowledg any figure in the words of Inſtitution, but contumelioufly call thoſe who own it, Figurative men, whereas it is manifeſt that all the Ancients did ſo call it. And indeed if there be no figure in it, it will be neither a ſign nor Sacrament. So that thoſe who traduce the maintainers of the other opinion as Sacramentaries, do indeed take away all Sacrament from it.

There is yet another thing, which the Ancient Fathers acknowledging to

Neque hic ſatis eſt, ſi modum unum carnaliter intelligendi fugiamus, & in alium impingamus. Nam qui Chriſti carnem edere ſecundum literam accipit, & quaſi locutio propria ſit; is Capernaita carnalis eſt; ſive id hoc ſive illo modo proprie fieri putat. —— Nam veriſimile eſt, Carpernaitas omnes quidem carnaliter intellexiſſe, ſed non omnes eodem modo, *p.* 53.

Non enim ideo ſpiritualis ſenſus exiſtimandus eſt, quia dicunt carnem Chriſti inviſibiliter adeſſe; nam ſi de propria carne intelligant, non ideo carnaliter non edimus, quia non videmus, *p.* 54.

Jam in hoc Sacramento veteres Patres duas res animadverterunt; propter quas ſingulas merito corpus Chriſti dicceretur & haberetur, maximè verò cùm utramque comprehendat. Nam & quia figura veri corporis panis eſt, jure corpus appellatur; & quia virtutem ejuſdem vitalem conjunctam habet, multò magis; tum verò maximè quòd utrumque complectitur. *Ibid.*

Quò magis mirandum eſt, quid illis in mentem veniat, qui figuram non patiantur appellari, nec figuram in Cœnæ verbis agnoſcant; ſed eos qui agnoſcunt, per contumeliam figuratores appellant cùm tamen manifeſtum ſit Veteres omnes ſic appellâſſe. Quòd ſi figura non erit, nec Signum, nec Sacramentum erit. Itaque qui in illos tanquam Sacramentarios dicere parati ſunt, ipſi omnino Sacramenta tollunt. *p.* 55.

Alterum eſſe diximus, quod veteres Patres agnoſcentes in hoc Sacra-

be in this Sacrament, taught it to be truly the Body of our Lord; And that is the efficacious and lively vertue of the Body it self, which is joyned with the Bread and Wine by Grace and Mystical Benediction, and is called by divers names, although it be the same thing: by Augustine, *the Intelligible, Invisible and Spiritual Body: by* Jerome *the Divine and Spiritual Flesh: by* Irenæus *an Heavenly Thing: by* Ambrose *the Spiritual Food and Body of the Divine Spirit: by others some other like thing. And this doth chiefly cause this Sacrament to be worthy of the appellation of his true Body and Blood, since it doth not only externally bear the Image and Figure of it, but also carrieth along with it the inward and hidden natural propriety of the same Body; so that it cannot be esteemed an empty Figure, or the sign of a thing wholly absent, but the very Body of our Lord: Divine indeed and Spiritual, but present by Grace, full of vertue, powerful in efficacy. For this is very frequent, that the names of things themselves be ascribed to their virtue and efficacy.*

The Fathers therefore in Treating of the Sacraments, use the words Nature *and* Substance *not Philosophically but Theologically: that is, they speak not as natural Philosophers, but as men disputing of Divine matters; they give the name of* Nature *and Substance to Grace, Virtue and Efficacy: the nature of the Sacrament so requiring.*

But this (that the Spiritual virtue is inseparable from the Elements) *is to be understood to be true, as long as the Sign serveth for that use, and is directed to that end, for which it was destined by* mento verè Dominicum corpus esse voluerunt. Est autem virtus ipsius corporis efficax & vivifica, quæ per gratiam & mysticam benedictionem cum pane & vino conjungitur, & variis nominibus appellatur, cùm res eadem sit; ab Augustino corpus intelligibile, invisibile, spirituale; ab Hieronymo caro divina & spiritualis; ab Irenæo res cœlestis; ab Ambrosio esca spiritualis, & corpus divini spiritus; ab aliis aliud simile quippiam. Et hoc multo etiam magis efficit, ut hoc Sacramentum dignissimum sit veri corporis & sanguinis nomenclaturâ: quum non solum extrinsecus imaginem & figuram ejus præ se ferat verùm; etiam intus abditam & latentem naturalem ejusdem corporis proprietatem, hoc est, vivificam virtutem secum trahat; ut jam non inanis figura, aut absentis omnino rei signum existimari possit, sed ipsum corpus Domini, divinum quidem & spirituale, sed præsens gratiâ, plenum virtute, potens efficacitate. Sæpe autem fit, ut nomina rerum ipsarum tribuantur earum virtuti & efficacitati. *Ibid.*

Cum agitur de Sacramentis, mentionem faciunt Patres Naturæ & Substantiæ, non φυσικῶς sed θεολογικῶς, hoc est, non ut Philosophi naturales loquuntur, sed homines de divinis rebus differentes, gratiæ, virtuti, & efficacitati naturæ substantiæque nomen impertientes, nimirum Sacramenti naturâ id postulante, *p.* 57.

Hoc autem (*inseparabilitas virtutis spiritualis ab Elementis*) ita intelligendum est, quamdiu signum ei servit usui & fini accommodatur, cui juxta verbum Dei destinatum fuerit. Nam

the

the Word of God. For if we apply it to other uſes, and abuſe it againſt the inſtitution of Chriſt, it either is altogether not a Sacrament, or ceaſeth to be a Sacrament.

The dignity and due honour of the Sacraments is not injured, but remaineth whole and inviolate, while we confeſs both the truth of the Body, and the nature and ſubſtance of it, to be received by the Faithful, together with the Symbols: which alſo the ancient Fathers teſtifie to be done. And then this diſtinction which alſo thoſe Fathers diligently obſerved, being received between that proper or aſſumed Body of the Lord, and this Symbolical Body, or Sacrament of the Body, the analogy of our Faith is not violated, which no ways ought to be ſhaken: ſince we attribute to each Body his peculiar properties. For we ſay that the proper and aſſumed Body is in a place, and circumſcribed with a ſpace, by reaſon of the modus *of a true Body, as* Auguſtine *ſaith,* &c.

All men ſee, that we alſo here affirm the Subſtance to be preſent, and aſſert our Communion with Chriſt naturally, and as I may ſay, ſubſtantially. But then theſe words ought to be underſtood after the manner not of Philoſophers but of Divines. Neither ſhould we quarrel about the term of Tranſubſtantiation, *although barbarous and not in the leaſt neceſſary: Provided they meant thereby ſuch a Tranſmutation of Subſtances, as the Ancients taught: that is, a Sacramental one: ſuch as is alſo performed in a man regenerated by Baptiſm, who is made a new man, and a new creature. Such as is alſo performed when we are converted into the Fleſh of Chriſt,*

ſi ad alios uſus applicamus, & abutimur contra Chriſti inſtitutum: aut Sacramentum prorſus non eſt, aut Sacramentum eſſe deſinit, *p.* 64.

Sacramentorum dignitas & debitus honos non læditur, ſed integer & inviolatus manet; dum & veritatem corporis & naturam ac ſubſtantiam illius unâ cum ſymbolis accipi fateamur à fidelibus, quod & veteres Patres fieri teſtantur. Deinde hâc receptâ, quam iidem Patres diligenter obſervarunt, diſtinctione inter proprium ſive aſſumptum illud corpus Domini, & hoc ſymbolicum corpus ſive Sacramentum corporis, non peccatur in analogiam fidei noſtræ, quæ nullo pacto convellenda eſt: quandoquidem utrique corpori quæ ſua ſunt attribuimus. Proprium enim & aſſumptum corpus in loco eſſe & loci ſpatio circumſcribi dicimus, propter veri corporis modum ut ait Auguſtinus, *&c. Ibid.*

Vident ſubſtantiam quoque à nobis (in hoc libro) præſentem affirmari, & communionem noſtram cum Chriſto naturaliter, & ut ita dicam, ſubſtantialiter prædicari: ſed has voces, non ut Philoſophi, ſed ut Theologi loquuntur, intelligi oportere. Nec de Tranſubſtantiationis vocabulo, quamvis barbaro minimeque neceſſario, litigaremus, ſi modò talem ſubſtantiarum tranſmutationem interpretentur, qualem Veteres agnoſcebant, Sacramentalem videlicet, qualis etiam in homine fit per Baptiſmum regenerato, qui novus homo factus eſt, & nova creatura: qualis etiam fit, quum nos

Christ, which examples the ancient Fathers used.

If any here require a Miracle (for some Fathers call the Eucharist a great Miracle) it is in truth no less wonderful, that Bread and Wine, which are earthly Creatures, and apt only to nourish the Body, should by virtue of the Mystical Benediction obtain that inward force, and such powerful efficacy, as to cleanse, nourish, sanctifie, and prepare to immortality both our Soul[illegible], and to make us the M[illegible] and one Body with Jes[illegible]

in Christi carnem convertimur: quibus Patres antiqui utebantur exemplis, *p.* 65.

Quòd si nonnulli miraculum requirunt (nam Patres aliquot Eucharistiam ingens miraculum nominant) non minus profectò mirandum est panem & vinum creaturas terrenas, & corpori tantùm pascendo natas, eam virtute benedictionis mysticæ vim insitam, adeòque potentem efficacitatem obtinere, ut & animos & corpora mundent, alant, sanctificent, atque ad immortalitatem præparent, ut nos membra Christi & unum cum illo corpus conficiant. *Ibid.*

FINIS.